

THE
CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

No. 4.]

APRIL.

[1826.

RELIGIOUS.

For the Christian Spectator.

BRIEF HISTORICAL VIEW OF THE SCIENCE OF INTERPRETATION.

THE apostle Peter says there are some things in the epistles of Paul, hard to be understood. He intimates that the same is true of the other scriptures. If Peter, a Jew, and an apostle living in Palestine, said this nearly two thousand years ago, no wonder if there are many things hard to be understood by us, who live in these last days, and in these ends of the world. How indeed can it be otherwise? Should an American write a book abounding in imagery, in illustrations, and arguments, drawn from the magnificent scenery of our own country; from our free institutions, our domestic society, in short, from every thing around us, and should a Chinese, who knew nothing of America but the name, read it, how many things would he find hard to be understood? What this book would be to this Chinese, in relation to its obscurity, the Bible is to us. The business of the biblical interpreter is to explain such obscurities, by making us acquainted with every thing to which the sacred writers allude. When he has helped us to draw from the words of the author the very ideas which he meant to convey, his work, as an *interpreter*,

is done. Considered simply as an *interpreter*, he has nothing to do with the *correctness* of his author's opinions, their *good* or *bad* tendency; he has only to tell us *what they are*. This species of interpretation is called historical and grammatical, chiefly to denote the sources to which the interpreter goes for help.

I well know there is another species of interpretation more common among us. I mean that which consists, not so much in an explanation of the difficult passages of scripture, as in a series of pious remarks on the plain ones. This kind of interpretation is well adapted to the object for which it was designed. This is, to affect the heart rather than enlighten the understanding. It answers a valuable purpose for the unlearned reader, and therefore has claims to our regard. This is the kind of interpretation in which the English commentators abound.

Some very able interpreters have appeared of late, on the continent of Europe, and have intermingled with their learned and valuable criticisms, some lax notions on subjects of theology. Their works are well adapted to enlighten the understanding, but not to warm the heart. They teach us the sentiments of the sacred writers, but do not impart to us their spirit. The picture which they draw on the

canvass, is true to the original in every respect but one ; the coldness of death is on it, instead of the warmth and glow of life. Such helps however must be used for purposes of instruction, till interpreters, of equal ability and more piety, furnish commentaries more in accordance with the spirit of the gospel. Hume and Gibbon were infidels, and missed no fair opportunity to give a thrust at Christianity. But who cannot easily distinguish between this wanton expression of their infidelity, and the information which they convey as historians ? and what scholar, who seeks a deep and thorough acquaintance with Roman or English history, will be so foolish as to reject their aid, at least till other histories of equal ability are furnished ?

The science and business of biblical interpretation, as they now exist, are of somewhat recent origin, though the interpretation of the scriptures is no new thing. It commenced with the return of the Jews from the Babylonish captivity. The Hebrew was then no longer their vernacular tongue. Many were ignorant of their history, their religion, their country ; and when Ezra stood on a pulpit of wood, and read in the book of the law of God distinctly, others stood on his right hand and on his left, and gave the sense, and caused the people to understand the reading. After the captivity, the learned Jews began to apply themselves to the study of their sacred books. At length there arose a class of men, called Masorites, who devoted themselves chiefly to these studies. They wrote out copies of the scriptures for the use of the synagogues, taught the true method of reading them, and commented on the sacred books. These Masorites invented the vowel points, and thereby settled finally the reading of the Hebrew text. The result of all their labours on the scriptures has been collected and

published in series of critical observations written in Chaldaic Hebrew, and entitled the Masora. From this book interpreters have derived some aid respecting Hebrew idioms and customs.

Christ, and his apostles by divine illumination, understood the scriptures, and taught them in simplicity and truth. The same was true, though in a less extent, of the immediate successors of the apostles, through whose instruction the people were taught the pure principles and doctrines of Christianity, till the beginning of the third century. Then arose Origen, a native of Alexandria, a man of learning and piety ; but unhappily for the cause of sacred interpretation, he gave currency to an erroneous method of explaining the scriptures, the influence of which is still felt. If the sacred books were to be explained according to the real import of the words, Origen thought it would be found difficult to defend every thing they contained against the cavils of skeptics. Being himself deeply imbued with the Platonic philosophy, and being pressed with these cavils, Origen's inventive imagination suggested the thought, that the scriptures were to be explained in the same allegorical manner as the Platonists explained the fabulous history of their gods. The thought was fanciful in the extreme, and better becoming the dark ages than the times of Origen. Still he embraced it, and gave currency to the notion, that though certain ideas may be contained in the words of scripture, taken literally, yet this is not the true meaning of the sacred writers. This he said is hidden under the veil of allegory. Hence arose the multiplication of allegories ; the notion of double sense and mystical meanings, by which interpreters have been led in almost every way but the right one.

From the third to the sixth century, Eusebius, Chrysostom, and

Theodoret, in the Greek church, together with Augustine and some of less note in the Latin, applied themselves to the interpretation of the scriptures. But, with the exception of the distinguished Jerom, they were not sufficiently learned, especially in the Hebrew language and Jewish antiquities; they were not guided by good rules, for interpretation had not yet become a science; they followed too much in the allegorizing and mystical path of Origen, and their critical works are comparatively of small value to the biblical scholar.

From the sixth to the sixteenth century, few vestiges of sound interpretation can be found. The Bible during this period was neglected, nay even proscribed, and the faith of the church was settled by the decisions of councils and the authority of the Pope. About the commencement of the sixteenth century, the study of the Bible was somewhat revived in Germany, and some better specimens of interpretation were sent abroad by Erasmus and others. Near the middle of this century, Luther translated and published the Bible in German, together with some commentaries. These were attacked on every side by the supporters of papal domination. To defend his Bible and stop the mouths of his opponents, Luther systematized and published the rules by which he guided himself in the interpretation of the sacred books. This treatise, written by Luther while involved in the conflicts of the reformation, laid the foundation of the modern science of interpretation. From that time it has gradually advanced among the biblical scholars of protestant Europe.

A new and far greater impulse was given to the study of the scriptures in Germany about the middle of the last century, by the publication of Bishop Lowth's *Lectures on Hebrew Poetry*. These were delivered at Oxford in England.

Since that time, some of their most distinguished scholars have devoted themselves chiefly to the study of the Bible, and the advances made in the science of interpretation have been truly great. It has been founded on the principles of language and common sense. The civil and religious history of the Jews, their geography and scenery, indeed every thing that pertained to the Jewish people or their country, has been made to reflect light on the sacred pages. While the biblical scholars of the Continent have done this, England has moved on in the beaten track of mere moralizing interpretation. She has given us commentaries distinguished indeed for their piety, but not at all for their learning.

Commentaries which unite great learning with great piety are yet a desideratum in the church. The Pilgrims left every thing dear in home and country, to plant civil liberty and the religion of the Bible on these western shores. God reserved it for them to teach the world true notions of liberty and free institutions. Whether he has reserved it for their descendants to unite great biblical learning with much piety, and thereby teach the world the true method of interpreting the scriptures, I cannot tell. I only know that every thing urges those devoted to the sacred profession in this country to study the Bible. It is demanded by the intelligence of American Christians, their desire to understand the simple meaning of the scriptures—their sound piety, which demands instruction drawn directly from the word of God—all unite in requiring of those who minister in holy things a thorough knowledge of the word and doctrine which they teach. Here too no set of doctrines is supported by civil authority, but the Bible is regarded as the foundation of our faith; so that the preacher's most important qualification is, as it always should

be, a knowledge of the sacred books. Besides, explanatory preaching is coming into use, and is beginning to be demanded by the people. Bible classes are to be instructed, and all are beginning to demand the appropriate evidence of the doctrines they are called on to believe. These things call loudly on those of the sacred profession to study the Bible,—to understand the Bible,—to preach the Bible,—and let me add, and let the sound echo through every part of our beloved land,—to live in accordance with the precepts of the Bible.

LAY PRESBYTERS, NO. XVII.

DIONYSIUS, the Areopagite, who heard Paul at Athens,* has been deemed by Nicephorus, Gregory the great, Baronius, and many others, the writer of the books which bear his name. According to these, he received a liberal education, and went into Egypt a little before the death of Christ, where he witnessed that eclipse of the sun which happened at the crucifixion, when the moon was full. The writer affirms, he was then in his twenty-fifth year; he nevertheless appears to have survived Ignatius and Trajan. The genuineness of these writings, which have received the scholia of Maximus, and paraphrase of Pachymeras, in the Greek; and the annotations of Corderius in the Latin, has been a matter of dispute through the last twelve centuries. The reasons furnished by Baronius, wherefore they were not mentioned by Eusebius and Jerom, are plausible; and his opinion, that the Clement named in them was not Alexandrinus, is probable. But his answer to the objection of Theodorus, preserved by Photius, that they exhibit an account of those traditions which grew up in

the church by degrees and at distant periods, is unsatisfactory. Neither is it conceivable that these books, which so plainly assert the doctrine of the Trinity, should never have been cited in the disputes with the Arians, nor that Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine, who mentioned the Dionysius of Athens, should have concealed, if acquainted with, his writings.

These works are probably those of a Platonistic Christian, mystically but argumentatively written, in good style, and with a free use of terms introduced by the disputants of the fourth century. Some have imagined that Dionysius, not the Areopagite converted by Paul, but the patron of the Franks, who were different men, of different periods, was the author of these works.

About the commencement of the fifth century we may with probability place them;† and supposing them the works of an anonymous and disingenuous writer, yet was he a man of more than ordinary talents and information; they are entitled to notice therefore, subject to these qualifications.

Not a solitary instance has been observed, rejecting the captions, wherein this writer uses the words *ἐπισκοπος*, *πρεσβυτερος*, *διακονος*, *bishop*, *presbyter*, or *deacon*; but instead of them, *ἱεραρχης ἱερεως* and *λειτουργος*, *governor of priests*, *priest*, and *minister*; *ἱεραρχης* is a refinement upon *αρχιερεως* not found in the New Testament: *ἱερεως* never there occurs for an officer under the gospel, nor *λειτουργος* for the deacon.

The term priest does rarely, if in any instance, appear for an officer in the church of Christ, in Clements Rom., Justin Martyr, Clements Alexandr., Origen, Gregory Thaum., Lactantius, or in either of the Hilarys. Irenæus infers from

† Blondel and Lardner place them at A. D. 490. Pearson, 330. S. Basnage and Daille, 520. Cave, 360. And others at different intermediate periods.

* Acts xvii. 34.

Levi's having no inheritance but the priesthood, that the apostles, forsaking the fields, became the priests of God. Tertullian argues, that because Christ is a high priest, those who are baptized into Christ, having put on Christ, are, according to the apocalypse, priests to God the Father. But neither of these writers has usually adopted the word priest for presbyter in his writings. Minutius Felix observes, that Christians had neither temples nor altars except their hearts, nor images, nor purple, nor dignities. Cyprian and Ambrose have used the terms priest and priesthood for the preaching office in the gospel, but do not ordinarily make the substitution.

The principal and distinguishing character of the ordination of a bishop, *ἐπισκοπῆς*, at the time of the writing of these books, appears to have been, "the imposition of the scriptures upon his head, which neither of the lower orders received."* But it was at this period accompanied by laying on of hands, which neither appears in the constitutions, nor in the Traditions of Hippolytus.† The present form of the ordination of bishops fell into practice at some later period, by the mere omission of that which was the earliest but unauthorized ceremony, of holding the scriptures over the head of a presbyter, when appointed to preside.

If imposition of hands is thought in our day to communicate either gifts or graces, experience will prove the reverse. And in the ordination of the *ἐπισκοπῆς*, it was not originally a constituent. Ordination, even when rightful, confers neither knowledge nor purity; and though at first followed by extraordinary gifts, it was no doubt intended as an exclusion of persons

unqualified from the offices of presbyter and deacon. Designations to presidency among presbyters were variously affected in different places. The duties were long merely parochial, even after the name of bishop had been monopolized. We have already seen, that instead of a *jus divinum*, diocesan bishops, as such, had no existence in the apostles' days: and the tardy advancement towards a secondary ordination shows that they knew that their legitimate authority was only presbyterial, whilst their episcopal superiority, being founded on human appointment, was continued by custom and supported by policy. Such is the history of the *πρόεδρος*, or ruling elder.

It has been often affirmed in our own day, that bishops are successors to the apostolic office. But the writer of these books thought otherwise, and probably wrote the sentiments which prevailed at the commencement of the fifth century. He represents deacons as directed "by priests, priests by archbishops, archbishops by the apostles and the successors of the apostles."‡

Neither in the *Celestial* nor *Ecclesiastical Hierarchy*, nor in any other of the writings ascribed to Dionysius the Areopagite, has there been found a word, a fact, or even a circumstance, which so much as excited the idea of a lay presbyter, or ruling elder, in the modern meaning of those terms.

John of Constantinople was born at Antioch, of Christian parents, but lost his father in childhood. His first object was jurisprudence, which he exchanged for the study of the scriptures. Becoming a reader, he discharged the duties with such acceptance that he could escape episcopal ordination only by concealment. He retired a few

* Ἐξαιρέτα δὲ καὶ ἑκκεῖτα τοῖς ἐπισκοπῆς μὲν ἡ τῶν λογίων ἐπὶ κεφαλῆς ἐπίθεσις, οὐκ ἔχοντων τούτο τῶν ἀφαιμένων ταγματῶν. Vol. I. p. 364.

† Vide Vol. VI. p. 184. ante.

‡ λειτουργοὶ δὲ τοῖς τοῖς ἐπισκοπῆς δὲ τοῖς ἐπισκοπῆς οἱ ἀποστόλοι καὶ οἱ τῶν ἀποστόλων διαδόχοι. Vol. II. p. 113.

years, afterwards was ordained deacon, then presbyter. His eloquence, upon the death of Nectarius, promoted him to the see of Constantinople, in 398. He was austere, choleric, distant, arbitrary, and sometimes imprudent, yet pious.* He died, in unjust banishment, in 407, at the age of 60. The name Chrysostom was conferred at a later period.†

In his homily on Ephes. iv. he places apostles first, prophets second, evangelists third; then follow pastors and teachers. These last he supposed to have been intrusted, some with a whole nation, and others to have been inferior. This archbishop of Constantinople appears to have made no claim to apostolical succession. Yet by virtue of canons of councils, he exercised the ecclesiastical power proportioned to the grade of his metropolis.

Having recited 1 Tim. iii. 3—10, he observes: "Having spoken of bishops and characterized them, saying both what they should possess, and from what they should abstain, and omitting the order of presbyters, Paul has passed over to the deacons. But why is this? Because there is not much difference. For these also in like manner have been set over the teaching and government of the church, and what things he has said concerning bishops, the same also he intended for presbyters; for they have gained the ascendancy over them only in respect of ordaining, and of this thing also they appear to have robbed the presbyters."‡ The condition

of the church could have then been better known to no one than to this primate; yet, when discoursing on the scriptures, he expressly allows government and doctrine to have been given equally and by the same means to presbyters and to bishops; that the latter had gained the ascendancy only in ordination, which they had injuriously taken from the presbyters; for such is the force of *πλεονεκτησιν*, followed by an accusative.

He appears to have rightly conceived of the identity of the episcopal and presbyterial commission in their origin. Yet because by the canons of councils, which were the supreme law of the empire, an ecclesiastical authority had been erected in every city proportional in dignity and influence to the magnitude of the city, and the degree of civil power conferred upon it, this writer discerned that the cautious exercise of the power of ordination was a matter of the highest importance. For having spoken of a solemn charge given to Timothy, he observes, "After saying this, (Paul) introduced that which is above all things vital, and conduces to the preservation of the church, I mean ordination, and says, 'Lay hands suddenly on no man.'"§

It is obvious that bishops differed only in the power of ordination from presbyters, and had gained this after the first times, yet he has expressed a sentiment on Phil. i. 1. somewhat different. If presbyters were in the days of Chrysostom equally as the bishops commissioned to preach and govern, they were not lay presbyters.

Upon 1 Tim. v. 17. Chrysostom plainly shows that the presbyters who ruled well were the same species of officers with those who laboured in word and doctrine, and ob-

* Vide Socrat. Scholast. lib. vi. c. 2—19.

† ὁ χρυσόστος τὴν γλώτταν καὶ τὸ στόμα ἰωάννης ὁ Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐπίσκοπος. Photius, fol. 890.

‡ τί δὴ ποτε; ὅτι οὐ πολὺ τὸ μίσην. καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἶσιν ἀνδιδιγμένοι καὶ πρεσβυτερίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. καὶ ἅ περὶ ἐπισκοπῶν εἶπε, ταῦτα καὶ περὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀρμόττει. τὴν γὰρ χειροτονίαν μόνον αὐτῶν ἀναβέβηκασι, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον δέκουσι πλεονεκτήειν τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις. Vol. IX. p. 1574.

§ ὁ εἶτα τοῦτο εἶπεν ὁ πάντων μαχίστα καὶ ἀρίστην ἡν ἐπηγάγε καὶ ὁ μαχίστα συνεχὴς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῶν χειροτονιῶν. Hom. xvi. p. 1611.

serves, "That it conduces greatly to the edification of the church, that the *προεστώτες*, ruling presbyters, should be apt to teach."* The "double honour" he understood to mean not merely *respect*, but the *provision necessary to him who presides*.† He also thought the portion was to be *double*, either to enable him to supply widows and deacons, or because he presided *well*.

He understood the grace of God which was in Timothy by the imposition of his hands, (2 Tim. i. 6.) not to be his office to rule and preach, but the influence of the Holy Spirit. The imposition of the hands of the presbyters, he deems the giving of the commission, but strangely and gratuitously affirms that Paul "*there speaks not of presbyters, but of bishops*."‡ That there were no diocesan bishops, and that the same officers were indifferently called presbyters and bishops at that period, are certain. Yet this evasion was not worse than making *πρεσβυτεριον presbytery* an office, which Calvin favoured, with some of the Latin fathers. The same arbitrary interpretation of *elders*, *πρεσβυτερος*, he adopted on Titus i. 5., "*he here means bishops*."§ Jerom's views were contrary, and they are established by evidence.

Referring to the passages in the letters to Timothy and Titus, he assigns his reason for such interpretation in his first homily on the epistle to the Philippians. "To the co-bishops and deacons, What is this? Were there many bishops in one city? By no means; but he thus denominates the presbyters, for

they had hitherto held those names in common; the bishop was also called a deacon," or minister.|| He afterwards justifies such commutation of names of office in ancient times, by the custom in his own day of bishops writing to their "co-presbyters" and "deacons," and supposes that in former times each was, notwithstanding, distinguished by his proper official title. But how destitute of proof this assumption was, we have already abundantly seen. Also he acknowledges there had not been either deacons or presbyters prior to the appointment of Stephen and the other six, and has given it as his opinion on Acts vi.¶ that the commission was of a special nature, and though their duties were in the first instance ministerial, yet they were designed to be preachers and did go forth as such.

Isidore of Pelusium flourished in the first part of the fifth century, and having adopted the monastic life, he directed letters to men of various characters and in different stations, even to the emperor himself. Some officiously reprove in pungent language; others temperately answer the bishops, presbyters, and deacons, who sought his counsel. Being in no instance entire, they appear as extracts, or abridgments laconically written. He avows the deliberate purpose of speaking freely, and causing men of no sensibility to blush for sin; and if he should thereby suffer, it would be with the prophets, apostles, and saints, an event desirable

* *προς εκκλησιας οικοδομην και πολυ συνελαι το διδακτικους ειναι τους προεστωτας*. p. 1605.

† *τιμην ενλαυθα την θεραπειαν λεγει την των αναγκαιων χρησιαν* Ibid. This comparison of the *προεστωτας* to him that leads in the choir, fitly intimates the parity of office.

‡ *ου περι πρεσβυτερων φησι ενλαυθα αλλα περι επισκοπων*. 1 Tim. iv. 14.

§ *τους επισκοπους ενταυθα φησι*. In loc.

|| *συνεπισκοποις και διακονοις, τι τουτο; μιαι πολεις πολλοι επισκοποι ησαν; ουδαμως αλλα, τους πρεσβυτερος οτως εκαλεσε· τοτε γαρ τωσ εκοινωνουν τοις ονομασι και διακονος ο επισκοπος ελεγετο*. In loc.

¶ *Οθεν ουτε διακονων, ουτε πρεσβυτερων ομιαι το ονομα ειναι δηλον και φανερον. αλλα τωσ εις τουτο εχειροτονησαν, και ουκ απλας ενεχειρισθησαν· αλλα επευξαντο αυτοις γενεσθαι δυναμιν—οτως ενεχειρισθησαν ουτοι τον λογον*. Acts hom. xiv.

for him who was one of the multitude, *ἐνὶ τῶν πολλῶν ὄντι*.*

His numerous letters against simony show it to have been then a common vice. He charges it on Eusebius, the bishop of Pelusium, whom he admits to be *προεστῶς*, but denies that he, *ιερασθαι*, renders the spiritual service of priest.† The early corruptions of the hierarchy are sufficiently evinced in his letters, which accord with the state of the church after the erection of diocesan episcopacy, and the general adoption of the canons of the council of Nice into practice. He uses the words *ἐπισκοπος*, *προεστῶς*, and *ιερεὺς*, promiscuously for the same office; but the last of these words most frequently both for bishop and presbyter. Nor has a presbyter been found in the volume, who was not a priest. Deacons and readers are often mentioned, but neither archbishop nor patriarch has been observed. Yet he repeatedly assigns a pre-eminence to Peter above the other apostles. This work, though of small importance in the history of the church, is nevertheless, by its numerous, brief, and often singular expositions of difficult passages in the scriptures, rendered highly interesting.

J. P. W.

A SERMON.

[By the late Rev. Chester Isham.]

HEB. xii. 25.

See that ye refuse not him that speaketh. For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth, much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven.

In this epistle the apostle enters fully into a comparison between the Jewish and Christian dispensations, and while in this comparison,

son, he is continually bringing to view the superior excellence of the latter, he now and then expatiates on the aggravated guilt of those who rejected its heavenly offers, and the impossibility of their escaping punishment if they persevered in this rejection. His reasoning in relation to this subject, runs thus—"It is a fact that disobedience, even under the old dispensation, was frowned upon by God—Now if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven. In other words, if men, in those days of comparative ignorance, when God spake on earth by Moses—when he revealed himself but partially and obscurely to the world—if men were thus punished for disobedience, how awful a doom must we receive if we remain impenitent and unholily; we who behold his brighter manifestations; we who hear his voice speaking to us from heaven in the person of his Son!"

In this reasoning, you will observe the apostle takes this principle for granted; namely, *the guilt of men is in proportion to the degree of light which is resisted*; a principle which recommends itself at once to the conscience, which is every where recognised in the Bible; a principle which runs through the divine administrations, and which will be acted upon in the day of final reckoning. In that day, to whom much has been given, of him much will be required. The pagan will be judged according to that knowledge of his duty which he enjoyed, or rather might have enjoyed, in a land of paganism. The Jew will be judged according to those special revelations which were made to him by Moses and the prophets, in addition to the information which was afforded by his unaided reason. The Christian, besides the knowledge which he has in common

* p. 664.

† p. 326.

with the pagan and the Jew, will be judged according to those higher and more glorious disclosures which have been developed by the gospel. In short, every one will then be judged according to the degree of light which here shone on the path of his duty. Taking this principle for granted, the argument of the apostle carries with it all the conclusiveness and force of a demonstration. He looked back on the comparatively dark economy of the Jews, and beholding the disobedient and rebellious under that economy, swept away by the indignation of heaven, how could he doubt respecting the fate of disobedience and rebellion under the gospel? There was no room for doubt. He knew that since the Saviour had appeared and brought life and immortality to light, and warned men every where to repent and prepare to meet their God, they could not any longer mistake their duty, and must be alarmingly guilty if they did not do it.

I say they could not *any longer* mistake their duty. By this I would not imply that the apostle supposed that the Jews were necessarily exposed to any mistake on this subject. By no means. While holding up the superiority of the new dispensation, he never speaks to the disparagement of the old. That was established by the wisdom of God, and was sufficiently clear to lead all *honest* inquirers to a knowledge of the truth. It was the same, in its nature and design, as the new dispensation. It taught, though less clearly, the same great truths; revealed the same eternal, unchangeable law, and the same scheme of redemption for ruined man. The same Saviour which is now made known to us was made known to Adam in the garden, to the patriarchs, to Moses, to the prophets. The same Sun of Righteousness which now enlightens us, enlightened them:

the only difference is, they saw its twilight, we behold its full glory. The way of salvation has been always the same. Christ has been the hope and the rejoicing of the saints in every age. Those who lived before his incarnation, looked forward; we in these latter days, look back; we all meet in Christ; the hopes of the church all cluster around his cross. There the patriarch Abraham fixed his hope as well as the apostle Paul. Though they lived under different dispensations, and hundreds of years distant from each other, they were both saved in the same way, and they are now singing the same anthem in the heavens. In short, what I mean to say is, that the revelations of God to man have been the same as to their *nature* and *design* in every age; but as to their *clearness* and their *fulness*, they have been different. From the beginning they have continued to be more and more clear, and more and more full. Those which were granted to the Jews, though sufficiently clear, and sufficiently full, to leave them altogether without excuse for their sins, were however very obscure and very partial, compared with those of the gospel. They were the shadow of good things to come, rather than those good things themselves. But when Christ, the desire of all nations, came down, then the shadow vanished and the substance appeared; the stars retired, and the sun arose; and now of course the guilt of disobedience which was before great, was increased a hundredfold.

Having now guarded against misapprehension as to the nature or value of the old dispensation, we are prepared to consider more particularly that increase of light which attended the introduction of the new. And let us first go back in our thoughts to that day, and for a few moments contemplate this subject as it then stood. When our text was written, the gospel had

been ushered in, and Jesus had returned to the bosom of his Father. What had the gospel done for the world? I answer, first—*It had revealed plainly and fully the moral state of man.* It is true the subject of human depravity was well understood before the time of Christ, but it received, in his instructions and those of his apostles, an illustration which placed it beyond a doubt. I have come, said Christ, to save that which was lost. I have left my ninety and nine sheep feeding in their heavenly pastures, and have come into this wilderness to seek that which had strayed away from my fold, and which is ready to perish. Again, he speaks of himself as coming in the character of a physician, which implied that man was labouring under a dangerous malady; and he represents himself as coming to afford him a balm which would impart to his languishing, dying soul the vigour and bloom of immortality. Again, in his interview with Nicodemus he appears as an instructor, plainly telling him that man, in his unrenewed state, was poor, and wretched, and polluted, and could not stand before a holy God. I came down, said he, from heaven; I know what heaven is; I have dwelt there from eternity; I know what man is; I know that in his natural state he is altogether unfit to inhabit those regions of purity. Again he styles himself the Saviour of sinners—of those who had transgressed the divine law and brought themselves under its condemning sentence. This law he explained, —removed those interpretations which the pharisees had put upon it for the purpose of covering up its claims, rescued it from those traditions which had made it of no effect, and held it up to the world once more in its native majesty and strictness,—held it up as the only and the eternal standard of right and wrong in his Father's dominions, and as extending its

claims over all the thoughts, and feelings, and affections of the soul; and thus he exhibited to man the awful extent of his moral deficiency, showed him clearly how entirely depraved and ruined a creature he was in the view of heaven. The same thing was also strikingly illustrated by his sufferings. It is true that every victim which bled under the Jewish economy was designed to produce the same impression. But how feeble must have been the impression which was made by the sight of a bleeding beast, compared with that which was made by the groans and agonies of the Son of God. After this great sacrifice had been offered, it stood forth as a truth never more to be questioned, a truth to pass down with the clearness of the sun to all succeeding ages, that man was *ruined*.

The gospel had also revealed clearly *the way of salvation*. What had been merely shadowed forth under the Jewish economy had now been accomplished. Jesus had drunk the bitter cup—had opened a new and living way to heaven. The sinner's duty was now made plain, so plain that he could not mistake it. He no longer had occasion to ask,—“Where-with shall I come before the Lord? shall I come with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? will the Lord be pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first born for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?” To such inquiries a voice from heaven would have immediately replied, ‘No, ruined sinner, I require no such offerings at thy hand: repent and believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved; look to Calvary and there see what has been done for thy redemption; go to the cross of Christ; there weep over thy sins, and pour forth thy supplications and thanks, and there I will meet thee as a sin-

pardoning God, and there thou shalt have a new heart—new joys—new friends—new hopes, and there thou shalt begin a new life and a new song.’ As soon as the Saviour appeared, repentance, and faith, and a holy life, were proclaimed abroad as the terms of salvation, and as the only terms on which man could be restored to the favour of God; and in the time of Paul, they had been explained and enlarged upon, and urged until they had become of all duties the most obvious.

Again; the gospel had disclosed the highest and most powerful motives to obedience. It had most unequivocally announced to man the momentous truth, that he is to exist for ever. This truth was indeed known before the time of Christ. David in view of the grave could say—“My flesh shall rest in hope, thou wilt not leave me in the grave.” But, enlightened as he was, and gifted as he was with the inspirations of God, how indefinite must have been his views of a future state, compared with those of the humblest disciple of Him who is the resurrection and the life. “I know,” said Martha, standing by the tomb of her brother, “I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.” She had learned this of Jesus. He had every where declared, the hour is coming, in the which all that are in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of God and come forth. He had brought life and immortality to light; revealed clearly an endless state of being beyond this transient one; taught the world that this is a state of trial, that of everlasting retribution. And now man went forth to act no longer as the insect of a summer’s day, but as an immortal, accountable being, with the eyes of heaven upon him, and the amazing realities of eternity before him; now he was called upon to live for eternity, to shape all his thoughts, and feelings, and

plans for eternity, called upon by the most commanding considerations which could be addressed to his hopes or his fears. On one hand, he saw the faithful, inheriting the promises—those who had here fought a good fight, and kept the faith, and overcome the world, exchanging their armour for the robes and the crowns of victory, and coming to mount Zion with songs and with everlasting joy upon their heads; and on the other hand, he saw the impenitent—those who had here refused to obey the gospel, sinking from those heights of glory into the world of eternal night, there to wail through years of never ending sorrow.

But this was not all. The gospel had brought another, and a very different class of motives to bear—motives without which the revelations of immortality, grand and overpowering as they are, could never have answered the purposes of human salvation. Man was lost, and how was man to be restored? his mind was enmity against his Maker, and how was this enmity to be slain? he had cast away the love of God, and how was this love to be enthroned again in his dark and rebellious bosom? Could the disclosure of hell do it? This would only stir up his fears, and blow his opposition into sevenfold rage. Could an act of forgiveness from God do it? But such an act could not be granted without sacrificing the principles of his justice and the rights of his throne. Here then was a barrier which prevented the mercy of God from flowing down to this world, and how was this barrier to be taken away? We are told that Jesus beheld the sinner lying in his blood, and pitied him; that he came down from his throne and dwelt among us, and bare our sins in his own body on the tree; thus magnifying the law which had been trampled upon, and all this that he might make such an exhibition of

the attributes of God as would charm the human heart back to love and obedience—all this that the sinner might look up to God and behold him in the undiminished lustre of all his perfections, reconciling the world to himself; that the ungrateful sinner might look to the throne of the Most High, and behold there mercy and truth, righteousness and peace, met together, and forming a spectacle so inviting, so moving, that as he gazed upon it, love might spring up, where all was before rebelliousness, and the beauties of holiness dawn where all was before darkness and disorder. O the length and breadth of the love of Christ which passeth knowledge!

Such were the motives to repentance which had been disclosed to those who lived in the time of the apostle. I trust you are now prepared to see the force of his appeal, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation? For if they escaped not who refused him that spake on earth—much more shall not we escape if we turn away from him that speaketh from heaven."

I have been speaking of what took place in ages that are past. But this argument admits of a closer application. It is now eighteen hundred years since Paul and the men of his generation went into eternity; and all this time the evidences of Christianity have been multiplying, and light has been breaking in from every quarter on the path of man's duty. With what an emphasis then can I on this age ask, How shall we escape? It is true we have not seen with our own eyes the wonderful facts recorded in the New Testament; nor is it probable that all those whom the apostle addressed had seen them—those who *had*, could indeed rely on the testimony of their senses; whereas we must rely upon the testimony of others; and for this reason, the

evidence may come to our minds in a shape less *vivid*, less *impressive* perhaps, but no less *certain*. You may never have seen with your own eyes George Washington, but can you doubt whether such a man has existed? No more can you doubt as to the truth of the facts recorded in the gospel history.

But there has been, in fact, a great increase of evidence since the time of the apostles, which the men of that age could not, from the nature of the case, possess. An objector then might have said, 'This religion after all may be a mere imposition, and though we cannot discover its falsity, yet it may be discovered by future investigation.' But no man can make this objection now: for I ask, what means the fact that this religion has stood for eighteen centuries; and that too when its evidences have been sifted again and again, by friends and by foes; when thousands in every age have been arrayed against it—thousands who have ransacked earth and skies in search of means to destroy it, and who have all along been exhausting upon it all the resources of ridicule, and argument, and eloquence? What means the fact that this religion has survived—nay, that it has gathered fresh strength and new glory from every attack of its enemies; and this too when it has been armed with no sword, no weapon of terror? There is now but one supposition to be made, and that is the supposition of its *truth*.

We are informed that in an assembly which had come together in Jerusalem, to decide on the question whether Peter and his companions should be put to death, a man, by the name of Gamaliel, thus addressed them. "I say unto you, refrain from these men; for if this counsel or this work be of men, it will come to nought, but if it be of God ye cannot overthrow

it." Could the members of that assembly now rise from their graves, and behold this religion rising, and spreading, and filling the earth with its glory,—what would they think?—what would they say?

I might also dwell on the fulfilment of prophecies. I might show how every thing has since happened as the Saviour foretold it; but on this topic I need only refer to the effects of his gospel on the world. He declared that just in proportion as his religion should be loved and practised, men would be made holy and happy, and earth would put on the aspect of heaven. The men of that day heard this declaration, but it was reserved for future generations to see it fully verified. *We* know that wherever this gospel has been heartily embraced, there the depraved children of Adam have been assimilated to angels and to God. We know that since Christ ascended on high, an innumerable company have embraced his religion, and have found it every way adapted to their desires as immortal beings, to their characters as perishing sinners, and to their wants as strangers in this land of sorrow. We know that they have been supported by its consolations, living and dying; and that while animated by its hopes, they could smile at affliction—they could smile at the tomb. We know that it has been their song in this house of their pilgrimage, and their triumph in their last agonies.—Here again, a flood of evidence comes pouring down upon us, which in the days of the apostle had only begun to accumulate.—Consider too that human knowledge of every kind has been rapidly advancing, and thus, by strengthening the powers and extending the views of the mind, has prepared it to see more clearly the evidences of Christianity, and to understand more fully its own obligations and duties. Consider too

our superior privileges as members of a Christian community. Those whom the apostles addressed had grown up either Jews or pagans, and of course had become confirmed in all the habits of thinking and feeling peculiar to those systems. But how different is the case with us! The first breath we drew was in a Christian land—a land where the tidings of redemption were brought to us in our cradles, where the story a Saviour's love is associated with our earliest remembrances, where the first language that was taught our infant lips was perhaps that of a prayer to our Father in heaven, where the first music that saluted our ears was perhaps that of a song of Zion, where we have been surrounded with shining examples of piety—men walking with God and ripening for glory, a land where the special influences of heaven have been descending, where God has been present by his gracious visitations, where hills and valleys have echoed with the praises of ransomed sinners, where we have seen all about us, friends and acquaintance, pressing into the kingdom, and where we have been urged by all the entreaties which friendship and affection and the word of God could suggest to lay hold of the same everlasting blessings.

What will become of *us*, if we die without holiness? If we are still in a state of impenitence, and if our sins are to be estimated by the light we have resisted, what an awful amount of guilt have we contracted, and what a dark and mighty accumulation of wrath has gathered over us! Sinners above all who have lived and died in this sinning earth—guilty above all the guilty generations who have ever passed through this land of probation to the bar of God—destined soon, unless we flee to the blood of sprinkling, to behold them all rising up in judgment and condemning us—O what will become

of us if we die in our sins? Better, far better for us, had our lot been cast in the shadow of death; nay better for us had we never been born. The time will be, when we shall call for death, but he will not come; and then we shall curse the day of our birth, and say of it, "Let that day be darkness; let not God regard it from above; let not the light shine upon it; let a cloud dwell upon it, and the blackness of night terrify it." How shall we escape? Those who abused their privileges eighteen centuries ago, escaped not; nay, those who lived hundreds of years before the day-spring from on high visited our world, and who abused the privileges they then enjoyed, escaped not. Could we look into the eternal prison, we should find them all there;—and there we must go if we die in our sins, and "if there be in that world of despair a place of intenser darkness, where the wrath of the Almighty glows with augmented fury, in that place we must dwell." If there be groans there, which swell above the rest by their louder tones of agony; such groans must escape from these bosoms. Have you never trembled, my impenitent friends, at the thought of going from this land of light—this gate of heaven, to that place of woe, and of carrying with you to that place a remembrance of your sabbaths—of the invitations of redeeming love—of the entreaties of friends, and their prayers, and their tears in your behalf? Why then will you take another step in that downward course? why will you, when Jesus stands ready to welcome you to his arms, to blot out your sins, and to make your exalted privileges the means of raising you to higher seats in glory? Come then, ye ruined souls, ye who have abused the richest blessings which heaven has yet lavished on ruined man, come with all your guilt, and cast yourselves on the mercy of God. Come now

in this *day* of mercy. To-morrow may be a day of darkness—a day of wrath. Refuse not Him that speaketh—Him that speaketh to you now from his word—from heaven—from hell.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

I HAVE met with a sermon, lately preached at the South, on the doctrine of the saints' perseverance. It contains much excellent matter, and will no doubt produce conviction in unprejudiced minds. But there is an argument against the doctrine in question, frequently drawn from the parable of the ten virgins, which the preacher thought it incumbent on him to refute; and this he does in the following manner.

"That the foolish virgins were not believers, appears, 1st; From the very title that is given them. Foolish, in the language of scripture, is the same as wicked. A foolish virgin then, is a wicked virgin, or an ungodly professor. 2dly; But they had no oil in their lamps [vessels]. What is the lamp of a professor? It is his profession, or badge of discipleship. What is the oil that feeds the lamp? It is vital piety, or the renovating and sanctifying influence of the Spirit. But these foolish virgins had no oil in their lamps. Then they had no piety; consequently, could not have been believers. But you will ask why it was said that their lamps were gone out; must they not *once* have burnt and *given light*? Certainly; but a lamp may burn brightly for a short time without any oil. If the wick be lighted, there will be a very bright temporary blaze,—brighter, perhaps, while it lasts than if there were oil in the lamp. This very elegantly represents hypocritical professors. They seem, for a time, to be all zeal, all love, all

praise, all fire, and as if they would immediately take heaven by violence; but soon return, &c."

This is ingenious, and certainly as conclusive as the reasoning it opposes: it meets the objector in his own fashion. But were it not better to show the simple meaning of the parable, instead of meeting one unsound argument with another equally unsound.

As to this allegorizing the scriptures, it would seem that the abuses to which it is liable must be obvious from a single specimen; and that it could gain credit only with the simple and unlearned. But this is far from having been the case either in ancient or modern times. Even so learned a man—I do not say so good a critic—as Dr. Adam Clarke, finds in the parable of the ten virgins the very same evidence that saints "fall from grace" which our preacher so ingeniously sets aside in the foregoing quotation. If the reader will look into his commentary he will there learn that, *virgins* denote the purity of the Christian doctrine and character,—that *bridegroom* denotes Jesus Christ,—*feast*, the blessedness of his kingdom,—*wise and foolish virgins*, those who truly enjoy and those who only profess the purity and holiness of Christ's religion,—*oil*, 'the grace and salvation of God,'—*vessel*, the heart, in which the oil is contained,—*lamp*, the profession of enjoying the burning and shining light of the gospel of Christ,—*going forth*, 'the whole of their sojourning upon earth.' Of course, when he comes to the words, *our lamps are gone out*, Dr. C. concludes, that those who hold to the perseverance of the saints, are in a palpable error. "So then," he says, "it is evident that that they were once lighted. They had once hearts illuminated, &c."

It is not much to be wondered at that Dr. Clarke, as a critic, sometimes quarrels with his own principles. Speaking of Samson's be-

ing made a type of Christ, of which he disapproves, he takes occasion to remark that "by a fruitful imagination, and the torture of words and facts, we may force resemblances every where." Of the justness of this remark, he, as we have seen, has just given us a proof from his own commentary.

Perhaps no part of the scriptures has been more abused by false interpretation than the parables, and no parable more than this. On a future occasion I may attempt an exposition of it; and in the mean time, since I have made a beginning, suffer me to add a few more specimens of exegesis similar to those above.

Origen, who was the father of mystical interpretation, taught that the scriptures contained three senses, the literal, the allegorical, and the spiritual, the last being a sense still more recondite than the allegorical. He carried his system to an extreme length, spiritualizing every thing, even to the minute parts of the victim offered at the altar. Subsequent fathers followed him, though, perhaps, with less extravagance. Examples every where might be collected from their works: but a few will suffice.

Let us hear then the ancients.—The two women who came to Solomon, contending for the living child, (1 Kings iii. 16,) as Jerom supposes, represent the synagogue of the Jews and the church of Christ, contending about the child, Jesus. Augustine makes them signify the Catholic church and the Arian and other heresies, which divide Christ in two. Ambrose makes them denote faith and temptation.

Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night showeth knowledge. Ps. xix. 2.—According to ancient exegesis, the first mentioned day means Christ, and the second, divided into twelve hours, denotes the twelve apostles. This interpretation is wonderfully confirmed

by the words of Christ, 'Ye are the light of the world.' *Day unto day uttereth speech*, then, represents Christ imparting instruction to his apostles. *Night* in the first place, signifies Judas, and in the second, the Jews; to whom Judas showed knowledge when he gave them a sign by kissing Jesus. Others understood the word *night* to mean the deep obscurity of the scriptures, an interpretation very consonant to their mystical hermeneutics.

Behold, I am gathering two sticks. 1 Kings xvii. 12.—Respecting these words of the widow with whom Elijah lodged;—You see, my brethren, says Augustine, that inasmuch as she did not say three sticks, nor four, nor simply one, but *two* sticks, she did it because she received Elijah as a type of Christ, and by gathering two sticks signified her desire to understand the mystery of the cross; for the cross of Christ was formed of two sticks; &c.

Again; The ravens which fed Elijah were the Jews, crying with shrill voices, Crucify him, crucify him. The two she-bears, that tare the forty and two children, were invisible and spiritual beasts, evil spirits, sent forth upon the wicked children of this world. Samson's

foxes were heretical teachers—persecutors of the church—and perhaps a hundred other things; for there is no end to these fancies.

"Many of the ancients," said Calvin, "treated the scriptures as if they were a ball to be beaten to and fro." The principles they adopted served as well for the enemies of truth as for its friends, and to defend the Christian doctrines, allegory must be arrayed against allegory without profit and without end. Thus the scriptures, instead of being the subject of sober investigation, became a sort of fairy land, where one set of shadows must be conjured up in order to conjure another down.

But these false principles are now generally discarded. It is surely time they were altogether laid aside. Yet I have heard, within a few months, from very respectable pulpits, specimens of exegesis which would have done no discredit to Origen himself. To those who have the wisdom and understanding of the ancients, the *σολιαὶ καὶ ὄντι* with which they supposed themselves endued, these allegorical or anagogetical expositions may be instructive, but to me who am gifted with no such penetration they minister little to edification.

A WAYFARING MAN.

MISCELLANEOUS.

[The following paper was lately read before a literary Society; and several gentlemen who were present on that occasion, having expressed a desire to see it published in our miscellany, a copy has been obtained for that purpose.]

ON THE MUTUAL INFLUENCE OF THE MIND AND BODY.

THE materialist, perceiving that the powers of the mind often in-

crease or diminish with those of the body, concludes that the mind is an organized system of matter. On the other hand, he who feels that this were a degradation of the noblest part of man, in rejecting the conclusion, almost seems to forget that the premises are true; and descants on the spirituality, dignity, and native energy of the mind, as though it were indeed a

pure etherial essence, not influenced or limited by any connexion with matter. If however we would take the proper course, we ought, whilst we maintain in theory the immortality and spirituality of the soul, to be materialists in practice; for although we should concede that the mind is immaterial, yet we cannot deny that it is connected with matter, and as much influenced by that connexion as though itself were material. And although mind has its own peculiar laws, which it does not share with matter, and matter those which it does not share with mind, yet there are other laws pertaining to their union which affect them in common; so that rarely can any great change occur in our physical constitution, without affecting the mind, or in the mind without affecting our material constitution.

This fact, thus generally stated, is acknowledged by all—but by few are its important consequences either fully discerned in theory or regarded in practice.

On the present occasion, while addressing an assembly convened for literary purposes, it will not, I trust, be deemed inappropriate briefly to discuss a subject so intimately connected with the interests of literature and of science. And although in pursuing this investigation, there may be little room for the excursions of fancy, or for the embellishments of style, yet to exchange some degree of elegance for greater utility it is hoped will not be deemed inexpedient.

With this apology for the plainness of what may be offered to your consideration, I shall proceed by a variety of arguments to illustrate the importance of a familiar acquaintance with the laws which regulate the union of the mind with our material constitution, not only to the men whose professional duties call for such investigations, but to all who desire to cultivate, with

entire success, the intellectual faculties with which they have been so amply endowed.

The proof that the mind is affected in its character and modes of action, by corporeal connexions, is clear and unequivocal. We may see it in the intellectual character of different nations, as affected by physical causes. Certain varieties of temperature favour pure intellect and the exact sciences: in others these are scarcely found, but imagination predominates and gives rise to a literature, bold, fiery, and vivid. In conformity with this, is the testimony of Sir William Jones. "To form," says he, "an exact parallel between the eastern and western worlds, would require a tract of no inconsiderable length. But we may decide on the whole, that *reason* and *taste* are the grand prerogatives of European minds; while the Asiatics have soared to loftier heights in the sphere of the *imagination*."

The same truth is illustrated by that variety of national intellect which appears at different periods of the history of the same nation, as various physical causes predominate. It appears also in the effects of any general alteration of modes of living, and in the general introduction or exclusion of any article of diet. Changes such as these may affect the physical constitution of whole generations, and with it their mental character. In short, we see that no general change of physical constitution can take place, without a corresponding change of national intellect; so intimate is that connexion of mind and body which has been established by the Creator.

But these causes of influence so extensive, are not subject to individual control. And though speculations concerning them may be curious and interesting, yet they are not equally practical in their tendency.

Let us therefore, that we may derive lessons of practical benefit,

contemplate the same truth as illustrated by the effect of physical causes in diversifying and changing the mental character of individuals. We may observe in the first place that capability of emotion, and of intense feeling, depends, much on the physical system. There are states in which all glow of feeling is impossible, and in which, although the mind perceives the propriety of emotion, and of what kind it should be, there is an absolute and invincible necessity of remaining unmoved. The perceptions of intellect in this case are like the rays of the moon, under a clear wintry sky—illuminating indeed, but not warming or comforting the solitary wanderer on his way. These negative states of the mind are found not merely in those who are cold and unfeeling by nature, but in minds of the most delicate structure and of the most exquisite native sensibility. And as it is the power of feeling which impels the intellect through undiscovered regions, originality, invention, and a lively imagination, depend much upon changes in our physical constitution. When the mind is invested with a glowing atmosphere of feeling, its movements are free and powerful, and all its conceptions are characterized by a corresponding vividness and ardour. Indeed, in minds otherwise equal, the impulse of ardent feeling will make one bold, original, and inventive, whilst the absence of it will leave the other tame and spiritless, even though richly stored with the discoveries of others. For the mind is a machine of exquisite construction; and feeling, or passion, is the moving power: without this, the native *vis inertiae* of man will predominate, and its movements will be slow and inefficient.

In addition to this indirect influence of feeling upon intellect, as varied by physical causes, is a direct influence of our bodily constitution on the mind itself. Vivacity

of intellect, rapidity of execution, ease of effort, and extent of acquisition depend much on the states of the bodily organization. Matter can quench, if it cannot kindle the fire of genius, and cause that mind to plod along its toilsome way, which, in other circumstances, would soar as on eagles' wings.

Again; our social affections and our moral emotions depend much upon the state of our physical constitution. Selfishness, suspicion, want of cordiality, and distrust, often result merely from physical changes. No doubt there is an original difference of constitution which causes those varieties of social character which are found among men; so that some are constitutionally more amiable, affectionate, and generous, than others. But this is not all: physical causes effect great changes in our social and moral feelings, in addition to this native difference of character, such as I have already specified; and by thus changing our social and moral feelings, they affect also our intercourse with society. Selfishness, suspicion, and distrust diminish the kind feelings of others towards us, and want of cordiality creates distance and reserve. As a consequence, cheerful and constant action ceases, influence is lost, and despondency ensues.

All these feelings are not in such cases strictly moral, nor are we accountable for them, except as we are accountable for inducing that state of physical organization from which they result. They are the offspring of a diseased mind, and cannot be shaken off whilst the physical cause remains. Every physical state of the nervous system, has a correspondent state of mental emotion, and to remove the latter the former must be changed. We might as soon expect through a coloured medium, to receive the light of heaven, pure and unchanging, as to expect that the mind in

this perverted state will transmit to us unaltered representations of things as they exist. We see all things in a false light; our judgments are false, our feelings are perverted, and ourselves miserable without reason.

From the preceding remarks it is plain that *decision of character* depends much on the physical state of the system. This quality of character, as Foster has ably shown, depends chiefly upon three things; first, the ability of judging with rapidity and correctness, and the habit of relying with unshaken confidence on such judgments; secondly, such a degree of ardent feeling as shall ensure the constant and immediate execution of the decisions of the judgment; and thirdly, moral courage, such as shall render the mind, whilst in action, fearless of the opinions, censure, or ridicule of opposers. But all these traits of character, as we have already shown, are affected by the physical changes of the material system. Personal experience, or observation, will recall abundant illustrations of this fact. Let those speak who have been the subjects of such a transformation in this respect as to become almost new men; who, from a state of vacillation, timidity, and indecision, have risen to ease of conception, energy of execution, and a fearlessness of pursuit after noble objects, merely through the influence of physical changes. Or let those speak, who, through the influence of such changes have become mere shadows of themselves, and who remember without hope those days of energetic, decided action, which caused a delightful consciousness of power and efficiency, never to return. This consciousness of power and efficiency is one of the most exhilarating sensations of the soul. She seems to realize her glorious destinies, and to exult therein; she ranges the field of noble vision unencumbered, and ex-

cutes her conceptions with cheering success. How diverse from that semi-vegetable state of passive acquiescence, or empty desire, or fruitless effort, to which this same soul by changes merely physical may be reduced!

Many of the peculiarities also of literary and sedentary men, commonly ascribed to the necessary and direct influence of their studies upon their minds, do in fact result from their studies only through the indirect influence of those studies upon their physical system, and might with proper care be avoided. Some of these peculiarities are, a want of social feeling, a limited range of conversation, and an indisposition to enter freely into the common interests of life. We all know that when susceptibility of emotion is diminished, the mind naturally turns to subjects purely intellectual, the discussion of which requires no excitement of feeling. And whilst in this state of mind an effort to sustain a conversation which requires an interchange of sympathetic feeling harasses and exhausts us. And this accounts for the fact that the conversation of distinguished scholars, is so often merely intellectual, and without a tinge of feeling. And we see why men of inferior abilities, but of strong feelings, are in conversation so much more attractive than scholars of superior minds, whose conceptions are clear but cold, definite but unfeeling.

But although physical causes have so extensive and important an influence upon the mind, though they so often weaken and disorganize its powers, yet no mental diseases are so little understood as those originating in a physical cause, none excite so little sympathy, none are more real, and none give rise to more exquisite suffering. The unhappy victim is perhaps ridiculed, or if not ridiculed, passes long and wretched hours in the miserable world, presented

through the medium of a diseased mind, till death sweeps him and his sorrows, to the land of forgetfulness; yet while the physical cause continues its influence, a man might as well attempt to heap Pelion on Ossa, as to remove from his burdened mind the pressure of dis-tempered imaginations. Let those testify, upon whom dyspepsia has laid her leaden hand, quenching the fire of feeling and imagination, checking the flow of intellect, and haunting the mind with spectral apparitions of unreal evil.

Nor are the evils resulting from this source limited to individuals. They affect the nation and the church. How many minds of the first order have been shorn of their lustre and deprived of half their power. How many men of great promise have been rendered uncertain and periodical in their efforts, often failing in times of greatest need. How many have just trod the stage of life, gathered their early wreaths of honour, and excited the hopes of friends and country, and then slept lamented in a premature grave. Look at our clergy, our literati, in short, at all our seditary men of literary or scientific pursuits, and how prevalent is the fashionable disease called dyspepsia, with its attendant remedies, diet, starvation, journeys, voyages, and exemption from labour. Indeed the fragile tenure by which we hold so many of those who are acting or coming upon the stage of action, is one of the alarming omens of the day. Often as the church has been called to mourn her sons, she has in prospect scenes of augmented sorrow.

Besides, in all professions the standard of acquisition is raised and will continue to rise. The years and the extent of study are increased, and many a young man fails because of the length and labour of the way.

But this evil is not inevitable. The most dangerous circumstances relating to it arise from the fact that its nature and origin are unknown to most of its victims until a thorough cure is hopeless, so that they can only alleviate what they cannot remove. Timely knowledge of a few simple principles, increased by experience, would have enabled them to escape the rocks on which they were wrecked, and to have made good the desired haven. But the evil, gradual and deceitful in its progress, often promising good when nearest to its fatal results, gives warning of its presence only when the foundations of ruin are deeply laid. Often, as the crisis approaches, the mind seems to receive unwonted vigour. Its vivacity and perspicacity are increased, its powers of invention augmented, and its interest in the subjects of contemplation disproportionate and absorbing. New ideas seem to flow upon the mind, glittering with unwonted brilliancy, and seemingly of immense importance and perfect novelty. The mind seems to revel in the luxury of successful effort, and to be so absorbed in the subject as no longer to be its own master. It seems to be given up to the tide of inventive imagination, which bears it along through scenes of novelty and wonder. In this state the powers of the mind are really augmented, and it has more than its usual originality of conception. But the objects of its perception have by no means that disproportionate importance or novelty which the mind is disposed to attach to them. And the whole state is often produced by the last desperate efforts of a diseased mind. We have similar bodily analogies; often in the insane hours of those whom disease is bearing to the gates of death, there is an increased energy of muscular action, which only indicates the power and dan-

ger of the disease. So, often after such periods of unhealthy mental excitement and mental reverie, there are periods of darkness and prostration. The powers of the mind are inert; all interest in ordinary pursuits is lost, and it seems rather to vegetate than to live. There is no energy of conception, no grasp of intellect; and the gates of the mind seem to be opened to that flood of strange, and dull, and gloomy imaginations, which flows through uncontrolled.

How common these periods of mental hallucination are, I cannot say. They can be understood only by experience, and those who have not felt them may not recognise the likeness. Many however, I am confident, experience the relapse and depression of which I speak, although they may not experience the mental elevation. But I have often noticed in the accounts given by others of their mental operations, descriptions of events similar to what I have described, and evidently the result of the unhealthy and preternatural action of the mind. I doubt not that often in poets, who are proverbially a "genus irritabile," that is, nervous to a high degree, many of the periods of inspiration, as they seem, are of this kind—preternatural and exhausting, and preparing the way for depression and gloom. And in the lives of scientific or professional men, I have noticed similar instances. Henry Martyn, after incessant study, and philological research, says of himself, "I scarcely know how this week has passed, nor can I call to mind the circumstances of one single day, so absorbed have I been in my new pursuit; I remember however, that one night I did not sleep a wink. Knowing what would be the consequences the next day, I struggled hard and turned every way, that my mind might be diverted from what was before it, but all in vain. One discovery succeeded another

so rapidly, in Hebrew, Arabic, and Greek, that I was sometimes almost in an ecstasy. I do not turn to this study of itself, but it turns to me and draws me away almost irresistibly. Still I perceive it to be a mark of fallen nature to be carried away by a pleasure merely intellectual, and therefore while I pray for the gifts of his Spirit, I feel the necessity of being earnest for his grace." In other places he speaks thus of some questions in Hebrew philology; "I have read, or rather devoured the four first chapters in the Hebrew Bible, in order to account for the apparently strange use of the two tenses, and am making hypotheses every moment when I walk, and when I wake in the night;" and after specifying some of his discoveries, he thus proceeds: "If I make any other great discoveries, and have nothing better to write about, I shall take the liberty of communicating them." Who does not regret that this excellent man did not perceive that this state of things was to be ascribed, not to a fallen nature, but to a violation of the laws of the mind, and that this preternatural increase of power and interest was preparing the way for darkness and despondency. Nor were the discoveries which in this state of mind seemed so important, in fact as valuable as they appeared to his excited imagination, though actually of some consequence. Accordingly, soon after, we find him writing thus; "My discoveries are all at end. I am just where I was—in perfect darkness, and tired of the pursuit."

A similar instance of the excited action in a diseased mind occurred during the life of the late Professor Fisher. He has described it, as a state of augmented power and activity in the exercise of all his faculties scarcely credible, and it occurred during a period of great physical debility. His own words are these; "To whatever subject I

happened to direct my thoughts, my mind was crowded with ideas upon it. I seemed to myself able to wield the most difficult subjects with perfect ease, and to have an entire command over my own train of thought. I found myself wonderfully inventive; scarce a subject presented itself, in which I did not seem to myself to perceive, as it were by intuition, important improvements. I slept but a part of the night, my mind being intensely occupied with planning, inventing, &c. All the writing that I did was done in the utmost hurry. Ideas crowded upon me five times as fast as I could put down even hints of them, and my sole object was to have some memorial by which they might be recalled. I was employed the whole time in the most intense meditation; at the same time, thinking never seemed to me to be attended with so little effort. I did not experience the least confusion or fatigue of mind. My thoughts flowed with a rapidity that was prodigious, and the faculties of association, memory, &c. were wonderfully raised. I could read different languages into English, and English into Hebrew, with a fluency which I was never before or since master of. During the whole time, though I was in a low state of health, I never felt the least pain or fatigue of body."

His mind in this state, as is usual, clothed all the objects of its conception, with a deceptive and disproportionate importance, and seemed to be entirely absorbed in the world of its own creations.

In conversation with other distinguished individuals, I have found that they have experienced sensations similar in kind if not in degree. And I doubt not that in most minds of the highest order, and of the most exquisite construction, if not in all, there may be induced by excessive mental action, united with physical debility, a similar state of mind. To those

who, through want of experience, cannot distinguish this state from the glow and excitement of a healthy mind, there is something in it peculiarly dangerous. For, encouraged by this transient augmentation of power, and by the apparent rapidity of their progress, they trespass upon the mind till exhausted nature fails. So did Kirke White: and he sleeps in an early grave. There is a state of mental power, resulting from the combined effect of perfect physical organization, and the harmonious action of all the powers, which much resembles this state of unnatural excitement, and with which it might easily be confounded by the inexperienced—although an attentive observer of the causes, circumstances, and nature of the two states might distinguish them with ease. The greatest danger however is always to be encountered by the inexperienced, and before he gains wisdom and discrimination, it may be too late.

It cannot therefore be denied that a proper investigation of this subject is of great importance to the intellectual world. Prudential maxims on all other subjects are often inculcated with diligence, from childhood; but how many remain ignorant of many of the simplest laws of our physical and mental constitution, till they are compelled to learn them by the miserable and irremediable evils which their transgression has caused. How many can look back and see the time and place in which the seeds of fruitful miseries were sown ere they were aware. They knew indeed that all was not well, but knew not precisely the origin of the evil. A few simple rules, a few explanations of the nature of things, might have saved them months of mental transgression, and years of consequent calamity. And are the principles which regulate this subject so abstruse that they cannot be stated and understood.

not merely by men of professional skill, but by all who are beginning to encounter the dangers of a studious and sedentary life. Would it be in vain if some one, taught by experience and enlightened by scientific inquiry, should communicate, by lecture, or in a treatise, those principles which might illustrate the subject to the young student, warn him of the dangers of the way, and enable him to understand his own mental and physical experience in season to avert impending dangers? Mankind I know in youth are thoughtless, and little inclined to reflect or to use precaution, or to resist the demands of appetites and passions. But a knowledge of principles will assist any one in practice, when necessity calls upon him to reflect and to use precaution; whereas he who is ignorant of these principles cannot become wise except by ruinous experience.

Is this subject unworthy of the attention of those who direct our literary institutions? In many of its forms I know that it is not tangible by precepts and penalties. Yet certainly much could be done, by the use of moral influence and by the diffusion of correct principles—and in some cases it might even become a matter of legal regulation.

It was well for Greece that athletic exercises were honourable. Muscle indeed is not mind, but it is the support and the instrument of mind. And it would be well for us if these exercises, or some equally efficacious, were more in vogue among certain circles in our own country. Some of the transatlantic literati seem to have participated in these views. Peter in his letters has the following passage which I hope to be pardoned for reading. He is speaking of a circle of literary men, most of whom were somewhat advanced in years. "I was not a little astonished when somebody proposed a trial of strength in leaping. Nor was my astonish-

ment at all diminished when Mr. Playfair began to throw off his coat and waistcoat, and to prepare himself for taking his part in the contest, and indeed the whole party did the same, except Jeffrey alone, who was dressed in a short green jacket, with scarcely any skirts, and therefore seemed to consider himself as already sufficiently 'accinctus ludo.' I used to be a good leaper in my day, but I cut a very poor figure among these sinewy Caledonians. With the exception of Leslie, they all jumped wonderfully, and Jeffrey was quite miraculous, considering his brevity of stride. But the greatest wonder of the whole was Mr. Playfair. He also is a short man and cannot be less than seventy, yet he took his stand with the assurance of an athletic, and positively beat every one of us. I was quite thunderstruck, never having heard the least hint of his being so great a *geometrician*—in this sense of the word."

It might perhaps be esteemed strange to find our American presidents, professors, and other literati, trying their strength by leaping, or by hurling the discus; but, may it not be, that if such were the fact, it would indicate the triumph of good sense over prejudice? One thing is certain,—that there is a marked change in the character of our learned men since the days of our fathers as to health, and capacity of long continued effort. The causes are various. Changes of society, modes of living, and other similar causes, added to the increased requisitions of a preparatory course, may account for the change. But, be this as it may, there are yet in operation no measures which shall avert these evils. And such a course of education as shall include a proper cultivation of the physical powers, as an auxiliary in obtaining the highest degree of mental greatness, is as yet a desideratum; although individuals, or single institutions

may be aware of its importance. But we may hope to see the day, when so much attention shall be devoted to this subject that the road to literary and scientific greatness shall no longer be marked with traces of pilgrims ruined by the dangers of the way, but shall lead those safely who tread its ascent, to the summit of their hopes.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.*

THE rapid increase of crime, both in Great Britain and the United States, has led to much discussion on the mode of prevention, and many plans for the improvement of the criminal code. They have had a happy effect in diminishing severity where severity was useless, and in preventing, to some extent, the evils which prisons themselves produced. But still crime increases, and still the politician and the philanthropist, and above all, the Christian, are called to new regrets at the failure of promising plans, and new efforts to check the swelling flood of iniquity, and especially of juvenile iniquity. The phrase, "childish innocence," must soon be banished even from the world's vocabulary, and "juvenile delinquency" is already used quite as frequently. Whatever the value of the improvements already made, and it is by no means small, one radical error seems to pervade the estimates of most of those concerned. They seem to speculate upon human beings as if they were inert bodies, to be acted upon, chiefly at least, from without, and to calculate their motions on the mechanical principle of counter-acting forces. If a man can gain to a given amount, by stealing, and we can produce a greater loss, by means of the punishment we in-

flict, they conclude we shall prevent stealing.

Unfortunately, facts are quite opposed to this theory. We will not rely on the evidence afforded by the entire failure of laws constructed on these very principles, or the frequent instances in which the heaviest penalties, or even death itself, has not been sufficient to prevent a theft in which almost nothing was gained. We will only refer to the fact, that in many dangerous occupations of life, it is deemed wise to encounter considerable hazard for a small immediate object. "How could you be so unwise," said an officer to a soldier, about to be executed for theft, "as to hazard your life for a crown?" "I hazard it every day," replied the soldier, "for five pence." We wish to go deeper, and if possible to test the principle of the calculation, on which many plans for the prevention of crime have proceeded.

Even a heathen poet could say, "Video meliora, proboque,—deteriora sequor," and the experience of every man tells him, that with the fullest knowledge of his duty and interest, he sometimes does that which he is convinced will be injurious. Why is this? It is simply because we are beings in whom passions, and appetites, and sentiments, are the moving power, and reason is only the balance wheel to direct and regulate our movements; and if any cause increase the power to a high degree, it will prevail for the moment. Indeed we do not usually act upon calculation of profit and loss. If we wish to cease to do evil and learn to do well, it is not by a mere effort of reason that we accomplish it. We are compelled, notwithstanding the boasted power, of that faculty, to act through our sentiments and passions, to array one desire against another, to check one passion by means of another, and to bring one

* From a Correspondent in London—dated Jan. 1826.

object into view to exclude another, which cannot even be looked upon with safety. In short, we are often obliged to deal with ourselves (mortifying as the truth is) as we should with a wayward child.

If this be the case with men, whose minds have received a high degree of intellectual and moral culture, and are filled with the best principles early implanted,—if even gross criminals are sometimes found among these, what can we suppose will be the case with those in whom the reasoning and moral powers have scarcely been exercised, and have never been enlightened, as is very generally the case with criminals,—in whom the inferior and animal passions have been suffered to riot and rule, without any check but that which they have given to each other? The force and direction of these passions is an element in the calculation referred to, without which the whole result will be deceptive; and this varies inconceivably in different individuals. In one man natural timidity or fear will be sufficient to overcome a feeble spirit of revenge. In his neighbour it will be entirely inadequate. In another person you may find a spirit of cruelty, or bravado, that will prompt him to murder, even for its own sake, and which scarcely knows the emotion of fear. Now how can any single punishment operate to restrain each of these from murder?

Without resorting to other illustrations, which will readily occur to every one, I think we shall be obliged, after every experiment which philosophy can devise, or philanthropy execute, to admit the result which the scriptures teach us, by implication at least, that *no code of criminal law, no variety, or severity of punishment, will be sufficient of itself to check the progress of crime. It must be effected*

by other means. Look back to that system of government which was devised by infinite wisdom, and carried into effect by almighty power. Watch the progress of the Israelites through the desert, and learn the inefficacy of the most terrible punishments. Fiery serpents were sent to destroy them,—the plague came and swept them away,—the earth opened and swallowed the offender, and yet Israel “sinned more and more.” Nay, how many do we see around us in a Christian land (and such *were* some of us) who fully believe the reality of future punishment, and yet go on in sin. The terrors of that awful prison of God’s wrath are not adequate to deter men from sin, and when its vials are poured out upon their heads, they “curse God and gnaw their tongues for pain.” The pains of eternal death work *no reformatons.* What then can be expected from the feeble inflictions of man? The criminal code may serve, like the surgeon’s knife, to remove the unsound and incurable member of the body politic; it may aid the operation of other means most powerfully. But after, all our efforts must be directed to purify the fountains of crime—the hearts of criminals: it will be in vain to check the stream merely. We must *teach* and *assist* them to bring their passions into their proper state. We must not merely give them the *opportunity for reflection* and leave them to reflect on past iniquities, and to devise means of escape or success in perpetrating future crimes, which will almost of course be, and is in fact, the chief occupation of the ignorant and degraded inmates of prisons; we must give them *subjects* for reflection, we must *show* them and impress upon their minds, those great objects of another world which are fitted to change the direction of their thoughts and wish-

es.* We must call often into exercise, and thus accustom them to exercise their better feelings, their sense of right and wrong, and those sentiments which belong to another world. We must even call forth those inferior feelings of self-interest, and regard to character, which have been rendered dormant by more powerful passion, and which will be a valuable aid in checking their power. In short, we must rely on a course of moral treatment as the means of curing this great evil. We must look to the criminal code as only furnishing an immediate restraint, like the bands upon the lunatic, and value it as the means of enabling us to administer proper remedies, and not as being a remedy itself.

I have been led to these remarks by witnessing the happy effects attending the labours of Mrs. Fry in the moral Golgotha of London, but especially by a visit to the house of refuge for young delinquents at Edinburgh, established and maintained by the benevolent efforts of Lady C. and other ladies in that city; and beg you will insert the following extracts from their *second* report.

"The institution was established by the exertions of a few individuals, who solicited subscriptions from their friends, for the purpose of rescuing from their wretched career some of those numerous victims of early depravity and crime who pass through the bridewell and other places of confinement in this city, without any progress towards reformation. Lamentable as it appeared to these individuals, that no remedy, of an extent

adequate to that of the evil, was attempted, it did not deter them from doing what they could, on a limited scale, in this highly productive walk of benevolence; convinced as they were, that in reclaiming a single boy from a course of crime and vice, a benefit would be conferred, not only upon the individual himself, but also upon the community. The committee have the gratification of confirming these views of the importance of such an undertaking, from the highest and most opposite authority.—In a late charge to the grand jury and magistrates of the county of Warwick, Judge Dallas alludes to an asylum for a similar purpose in that county, in the following terms:—"Who can have beheld, but, at the moment, with a sinking heart, a miserable boy dismissed from the bar of a court of justice, to be released at the end of a short confinement, without protection, without parents, or what is worse, the authors of his being, the authors also of his profligacy, without means of employment, or prospect of subsistence, and driven almost of necessity into the downhill path of guilt, till, by an impulse which becomes at last irresistible, he is hurried to the precipice on the brink of which no stay is to be found! To provide for the future reception and employment of these unhappy persons, and to inspire them with the love and fear of God, and a due respect for man, is the most prominent feature of your plan.—It wants not to be recommended, it cannot be dignified by me. It is a fabric which, should it rise, will require no inscription."

"The plan upon which the Edinburgh Institution has been conducted, is extremely simple; being calculated merely to introduce the young delinquent to the healthful influence of a well-ordered family—where the comfortless and demoralizing scenes to which he has

* I have been assured that in one of our penitentiaries the keeper refused to allow a prisoner who was anxious on religious accounts to have a *Bible*, because it would diminish the severity of his punishment! I earnestly hope such a violation of common sense and Christian obligation is not now permitted. In the prison of Glasgow a *considerable library* has been procured for the use of the prisoners, and has produced happy effects.

previously been accustomed, are exchanged for a decent home, and where kind and conciliating measures to promote his welfare, address themselves to any remains of right feeling that may have survived the deadening influence of his former abandonment to a course of crime. The establishment is intended for the reception of eight boys: it consists of a house, together with (what has been found a very material part of the plan) a large garden, in which the boys find employment in their leisure hours, and which, under their culture, supplies the family with vegetables. The trade to which the boys are trained is shoemaking. The superintendent is their master in this art; and his wife, with one female servant, takes the whole domestic management of the house. A respectable teacher attends for two hours every evening to instruct the boys in reading and writing,—acquirements which scarcely any of them are found to have obtained to any extent on their entrance to the institution. Religious instruction, of which an equal deficiency is discovered, forms a prominent feature in their daily intercourse with their worthy superintendent and teacher.

“In reporting the proceedings of the last year, the committee conceive they have solid grounds of encouragement to offer to the supporters of the institution. The commencement of the attempt was marked by many adverse occurrences, and called for all the unwearied attention which was bestowed upon it by two or three of its early friends. Through their exertions, it was brought to a state that has required comparatively little interference from the present committee; and afforded but few subjects for their report, beyond the substantial one, of the quiet and beneficial operation of the plan.

“By the last report, it appeared, that on the 6th of October,

1824, ‘five boys remained in the house, behaving extremely well.’ Since that period, there have been admitted six, making a total of eleven.

“Of these, eight are at present in the institution, giving every promise, by their contented and orderly conduct, that the wishes of their benefactors, on their behalf, will be realized; two have been apprenticed out to masters in the town, neither of whom have returned to their former habits; one has been removed by death.

“The death of the last mentioned boy with many affecting proofs of his gratitude for the kindness which he had experienced in the institution, and which he seemed deeply to feel, as contrasted with the wretched circumstances in which he might have concluded a life that had been apparently cut short by the criminal neglect of his parents. He seemed also in the intervals of acute pain, which marked his last days, to value the instructions of those who attempted to set before him a hope beyond the grave.”

“It may be satisfactory for the public to know, that since the commencement of this institution in May 1823, twenty-nine boys have been admitted in all; twenty are doing well; the remaining nine were but a very short time in the institution before they absconded, or were dismissed as incorrigible. These occurrences took place during the first year; for since January 1824, no boy has either absconded, or been dismissed.”

“In viewing the institution, however, which forms the subject of the present report, as calculated to encourage the promotion of similar attempts, the committee would not deal honestly with the public, were they to conceal the important fact, that the superintendent and his wife who manage this establishment are persons of exemplary piety; and they are

bound in gratitude to the Giver of all good, to acknowledge that the measure of success which has attended the experiment has flowed through the medium of the almost paternal affection which the destitute condition of these poor children has inspired in the breasts of those excellent individuals, and which has led to the most influential mode of inculcating instruction."

I had the gratification of visiting this institution with one of its earliest and most devoted patrons, and of conversing with the boys and their master, soon after the above report was printed, and found the truth of its statements. I could scarcely persuade myself that boys who exhibited so much of that modesty and docility in their eye and countenance, which delights one who is familiar with youth, should have been so recently the perpetrators of infamous crimes, the pests of the city. My surprise and pleasure were increased when I witnessed the solemnity and interest with which they listened to religious exhortation from a gentleman of the party, and the propriety with which they closed our meeting in a hymn. They had been old offenders, and one of them had been eight or ten times in bridewell, but so happy had been the influence of the institution upon them, that they were now sent some distance into the city with messages, parcels, and even money for the payment of bills, and not one had betrayed his trust. All this had been accomplished by moral measures. No bars or bolts had been employed—they are always at liberty to leave the institution when they think proper, and the master has not even the authority produced by indenture of apprenticeship. It is the simple effect of the word of God presented with kindness and enforced by example—an effect far surpassing that of bolts or bars,

of dungeons or of fetters. May the experiment be tried in my own country.
W.

For the Christian Spectator.

LOTTERIES.

I SEE it stated in the papers, that *eleven lotteries* have been drawn in Maryland during the past year, and that a still greater number will probably be drawn in the year to come. According to a scheme which I have before me, one of these lotteries contained forty thousand tickets. Taking this as the average number, which is probably too low, the tickets in the eleven lotteries together amounted to four hundred and forty thousand. A large proportion of these were sold in quarters and eighths; the number of purchasers, therefore, may be estimated at about a million. The price of tickets varied from five to fifty dollars: taking twelve dollars as a medium, the million purchasers adventured five millions of dollars in the Maryland lotteries. To these add the lotteries of other states, and we have a tolerable estimate of the prevalence of the lottery spirit in the American community. This estimate, it is true, is loosely made, but it is not so wide of the truth as materially to affect the purpose for which it is exhibited.

If there is any justness in the facts and reasonings usually adduced to show the pernicious effects of lotteries, it is time they were prohibited. The Massachusetts legislature have lately done something with a view to check the growing evil—enough perhaps to show their sense of its existence—but little, it is apprehended, to remove it. It is not enough to impose restraints upon it: if the system be what it has been represented to be, it should be proscribed altogether.

Nor is it a valid argument for its continuance, that it is made subservient to objects of public interest, and is thus productive of benefits which may be regarded as a set-off to the evils it occasions. Canals, bridges, or other objects for which lotteries are commonly authorized, important as they may be, are obtained too dearly, if obtained by means unfavourable to the rational pursuits of industry, and sober habits, in a considerable portion of the community.*

England long pursued the lottery system as a source of revenue, but at length discovered that it augmented her poor rates faster than it swelled her treasury. Laws successively enacted did not prevent its abuses, and in 1816 a resolution was introduced into the House of Commons with a view to abolish it entirely. The attempt failed; but it has since been renewed with success. An English writer informs us, that during the debate on the resolution referred to, "various instances were related of the mischievous effects of the Lottery, and of the infatuation which had blinded the dupes of this species of gambling. A prize was frequently the ruin of a whole town or village, by exciting among the inhabitants a propensity to engage in this losing game. Mr. Buxton related a curious instance of a village where there was a benefit society for the support of the sick and aged. In a town in the neighbourhood, there was an association of a different kind, formed for speculating in the Lottery; a prize was gained of two or three thousand pounds, which immediately

brought the poor benefit society into contempt, and a *Lottery Club*, at which both old and young subscribed, was substituted in its place. In a few years both the lottery club and the benefit society failed. Mr. Buxton, on inquiring into the cause of the bankruptcy of these establishments, was told by one of the members, that somehow they had been singularly unlucky, that they had gained but few prizes, and unaccountable as it may seem, these prizes were no better than blanks. The fall of the *lottery club* had dragged down with it the ruin of the benefit society."

"One ticket was held by no less than twenty-eight persons, and from an account which had been kept of their employment and circumstances, it appeared that they were all extremely poor, and of that unfortunate class most likely to be led astray by the fraudulent allurements of the Lottery. The infatuation, indeed, of having recourse to this delusive scheme of bettering their condition, extends even to the workhouse. It was proved in evidence before the House, that in the workhouse in the parish of Spitalfields, the poorest spot in London, the paupers actually subscribed together to buy a lottery ticket. The money was raised by these wretched people by instalments of from one half-penny to sixpence each."

The system may not yet have reached the same maturity of evil in our country; yet it is not improbable that a similar discussion might develope similar facts among us. It might not actually appear that the inmates of our alms-houses had formed themselves into joint-stock companies for the purchase of a ticket or a fraction of a ticket, but it would be shown that very many of the adventurers in this sort of enterprise were already fit subjects for the alms-house, and would probably, in spite of their golden expectations, soon to be actual te-

* When a government derives a profit from the licensing of lotteries or gambling houses, what does it else but offer a premium to a vice most fatal to domestic happiness and destructive to national prosperity? How disgraceful is it, to see a government, thus acting as the pander of irregular desires, and irritating the fraudulent conduct it punishes in others, by holding out to want and avarice the bait of hollow and deceitful chance."—*Say's Political Economy.*

nants there. My pursuits daily lead me to an office where lottery tickets are sold, and I constantly see there men whose wretched appearance proclaims the indolence or viciousness of their lives, and the forlorn condition of their families. The sum paid is the fruit, perhaps, of an irregular fit of industry, inspired by the splendid promises of the lottery dealers, and then discontinued till the result of the adventure shall add despair to habitual listlessness, or prompt to fresh attempts to bribe the goddess of Fortune.

But I have not taken up my pen with a design to expose fully the evils incident to lotteries. Their influence is essentially the same, wherever they are tolerated, and if in England it has been found necessary to prohibit them, the same reasons call for their suppression here. These reasons will not, I trust, long be disregarded by our wise legislators. In the mean time, as the removal of popular evils by legislative interference is generally preceded by an intimation of the popular sentiment, I have thrown out these hints from a desire to contribute my unit towards such an intimation.

FRANKLIN.

P. S. One word on the deceptive nature of lotteries. They are proverbially illusive, but are still more so than the unthinking adventurer imagines. To the customary *drawback* of fifteen per cent., add twenty-five per cent., which as I am informed usually goes to the contractors, and we have an amount of forty per cent. against the whole concern. Let us see how the remaining portion is divided into prizes. In the scheme before me there are one hundred and thirteen prizes of sixty dollars and upwards. All the remaining prizes, being of a very low denomination, ought, in fairness, to be reckoned among the blanks. Con-

sidering these as blanks then, there are in this lottery more than *three hundred and fifty blanks* to a prize; though the scheme declares, in capitals, that there is "not one blank to a prize." The chance of a ticket-holder for obtaining a prize of not less than one hundred dollars, is as one to seven hundred and fifty-four; his chance for a thousand dollars is as one to three thousand and seventy-six; but then, finally, there is the bewildering dream of winning the highest prize, the chance being only forty thousand to one against him.

To the Editor of the Christian Spectator.

YOUR pious readers, while they approve of the sentiment contained in the following lines, will, I hope, allow them sufficient lyric merit to justify their insertion in your miscellany. They are from an old manuscript, written nearly half a century since, by a lady in Massachusetts.

M.

PROOFS OF CHRIST'S DIVINITY.

Such mighty works and miracles,
By him on earth were done,
As saints of old, who were inspired,
Ascribed to God alone.

'Tis God alone can pardon sin,
And make the sinner live;
But Jesus also, while on earth,
Did numerous sins forgive.

'Tis God alone can raise the dead,
And save in death's dark hour;
Christ Jesus call'd the dead to life,
By his almighty power.

God calms the storm, rebukes the wind,
And walks upon the waves;
All this did Jesus, and from fears
His trembling people saves.

God through the earth in wonders goes,
And man perceives him not;
Thus Christ unseen went through his
foes,

Who for his life did plot.

The worship due to God alone,
Christ Jesus did receive,
And all his Godhead do confess,
Who did on him believe.

God doth the clouds his chariot make,
 Christ did in clouds ascend,—
 And in like manner he will come,
 In judgment at the end.

Let saints adore, and trust his name,
 Nor ever be afraid;
 For at his coming he'll perform
 Each promise he has made.

REVIEWS.

Discourses on the Offices and Character of Jesus Christ. By HENRY WARE, Jr. Minister of the Second church in Boston. Boston. 1825.

THE author's object, in these sermons, appears to be, not to discuss metaphysically or controversially the nature and attributes of Christ, but rather so to exhibit his offices and character, as to "aid believers in rightly appreciating their relation to the Saviour, and in cultivating the sentiments and habits which it requires." In this light we shall consider them and shall endeavour to exhibit the views of the author in respect to the topics which he has selected, and to judge of their adaptation to the end proposed.

But before we proceed we must notice an important defect which presents itself at the outset. An author, we admit, may limit himself as he pleases. If Mr. W. chooses to confine himself to the discussion merely of the official character of Christ, he is at liberty to do so. But his readers may inquire, are his limitations proper, and consistent with the object proposed; does he in leaving out of view the *nature and attributes* of Christ adopt the best mode of 'aiding believers in rightly appreciating their relation to him, and in cultivating the sentiments and habits which it requires?' For can we determine that relation, or cultivate those sentiments and habits, while we are ignorant whether he is our Creator, our

Preserver, and our God, or a mere created and dependent being? Is it not evident that our most important relations cannot be known until we know the nature of Christ? Mr. W. in his sermon 'on honouring the Son' is of the contrary opinion. After remarking that our whole knowledge of God is comprised in a few facts, and specifying his omnipresence, omniscience, omnipotence, and eternity, he proceeds:

"These facts respecting the Deity, constitute what are called his natural attributes. They enter into the very definition of God; so that a being, who does not possess these attributes of almighty power, universal presence, infinite knowledge, and spirituality is not God.

"Now the question before us is, whether it be these attributes, which require of us the honours we pay to God? Though without these he would not be God, yet is it these, upon which are built religious homage and allegiance? There is one simple consideration, which, I think, may satisfy us, that it is not, certainly not entirely nor chiefly; and that is, that if these natural attributes were united with an *evil and malignant character*—supposing such a union possible—we could not be bound to render to that Being the same homage, which we now render to our beneficent Creator. If, for example, Satan, the personified principle of evil,—selfish, perverse, and malicious—were a self-existent, all-knowing, all-powerful, omnipresent, eternal, spirit; still, we should not for a moment imagine, that the honours, now paid to the infinitely Good, would of right belong to him.

"If then, these attributes do not form the ground of the honours rendered to the Father; what are the divine per-

fections to which they are rendered? Obviously, those which we call the *moral* perfections—his essential holiness, his perfect rectitude, unerring wisdom, unwavering truth and faithfulness, impartial justice, infinite goodness and mercy. He is clothed with righteousness, purity, and love—the kind Creator, the observing Governor, the gracious Father; earnestly desiring first the perfect virtue, and then the perfect happiness, of every living being. For these attributes he is revered; for these it is that angels and archangels praise him, and hymns of adoration ascend from the lips of glorified spirits; for these it is that his people bend in awe before him, for these that his children love him, and his saints bless him. ‘Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and magnify thy name? for thou only art HOLY.’ ‘Praise the Lord, for he is GOOD, for his mercy endureth for ever.’”

pp. 184—186.

But there is an essential defect in this argument. It does not follow that, because God's natural attributes would not *alone* render him worthy of divine honour, they are not an essential part of the ground of our obligation to render him such honour. It might be proved, if our author's reasoning is correct, that we do not worship God for his moral qualities; for it is self-evident that a being morally perfect but without infinite power could neither deserve nor claim supreme love and entire devotedness, since he could neither protect his friends, nor execute his benevolent purposes, but must exhibit the miserable spectacle of a good being constantly frustrated in all his undertakings by power beyond his control. Though we might be satisfied with the moral character of such a being, yet who could trust in him and commit to his care the interests of eternity? To place this subject in a stronger light, let us for a moment adopt our author's own mode of reasoning. We concede that a being without holiness, justice, goodness, and truth, is not God. “But the ques-

tion before us is whether it be these attributes which require of us the honours we pay to God. Though without these he would not be God, yet is it these upon which are built religious homage and allegiance? There is one simple consideration which we think may satisfy us that it is not, certainly not entirely nor chiefly, and that is, if these moral attributes were united with a *weak and limited* character—supposing such a union possible—we could not be bound to render to that being the same homage which we now render to our Almighty Creator. If, for example, Christ were a created, limited, dependent, mutable, being, and yet perfectly holy, just, good, and merciful, still we should not for a moment imagine, that the honours now paid to the Almighty would of right belong to him.

If then these attributes do not form the ground of the honours rendered to the Father, what are the divine perfections to which they are rendered? Obviously those which we call the natural perfections—his infinite power and wisdom, his omniscience, omnipresence, and eternity.—For these he is revered and for these he is adored by the heavenly hosts saying, “we give thee thanks, O Lord God ALMIGHTY, which art and wast and art to come, because thou hast taken to thee thy great *power*, and hast reigned.”

We think this argument equally conclusive with that of our author: but as they seem to contradict each other, we can assign no weight to either. The fact is, and we had supposed it too plain to be mistaken, that the character of God claims our homage, as a whole, and that if you take away either his natural or his moral qualities he is no longer perfect. Neither class of qualities is the *exclusive* ground of our obligation to worship him as our God, but the union of both.

Of course the question must again recur, does Christ unite them both? Respecting his moral character there is no dispute, but has he any natural attributes which by their union with his moral qualities will make him an object of worship? We wonder that any one can avoid seeing the question in this light. Can it be said that we have made any progress in "appreciating our relation to the Saviour, and in cultivating the sentiments and habits which it requires," so long as this point is unsettled? It is impossible, we repeat it, to know all our relations to Christ while we are ignorant of his nature. To say that the scriptures are silent on this subject, is simply to assume the point in debate; for we maintain that their testimony is full and explicit. There appears therefore to be no possible way of avoiding the discussion of the nature and attributes of Christ, if we would know fully our relations to him, and our consequent obligations. The case is so plain that we may say nothing is decided while we remain unresolved whether we are to worship Christ as our Lord and our God, or merely to regard him as a holy being who is the medium of communication between God and ourselves. And indeed, Mr. Ware, although he professes to decline the discussion of this question, is nevertheless obliged to decide it, and does in effect decide it most fully. So impossible is it to be neutral on so elementary a point of inquiry.

But we return to the exhibition which the author has made of his sentiments respecting Christ. His theory on this subject is, that he is an authorized messenger of God, but not himself divine; and that most or all of his appellations, in the scripture, have reference to this fact. In his first discourse, entitled "Christ the foundation," Mr. W. attempts to show that Christ

is the foundation of the church, because "the Christian religion rests on his authority;" "because to believe in him as the predicted Messiah is the fundamental article of faith;" "because he is the source of all satisfactory religious knowledge;" because "he is the foundation of true morality; and of the believer's hope."

In his second discourse, on the character of the Messiah, he thus explains his views of that office:

"He was to make the final revelation of God's will; to establish a church which, as a spiritual empire beneath his authority, should perpetuate the knowledge and influence of religious truth; to spread light and happiness and peace by means of his institutions; to free men from the bondage of superstition, the degradation of vice, and the terrors of death; in a word, to set up the dominion of God's holy and parental government, and prepare men for heaven by bringing them on earth to the love and practice of those holy graces which form the bliss of the good hereafter. To this end he was born and to this end he came into the world, that he might bear witness to the truth;—the truth which 'makes free' from corruption and sin, and 'sanctifies' the soul.

"It is evident from what has been said, that the character in which our Lord appears, and in which he claims to be received and honoured, is an *official character* simply. He comes to the world invested with a certain office, whose main duties have been mentioned, and is an object of attention and reverence as *holding that office*. It is the *dignity of the commission*, which is evidently referred to in all these representations. They plainly have no allusion to the nature of his person, or the rank of his being, or his original station of existence. They suggest no subtle discussions concerning his essence and attributes. They are satisfied with pointing him out to us as one ordained to accomplish the most beneficent purposes of heaven, and for this reason demanding the faith and obedience of man." pp. 41, 42.

In his third discourse, he illus-

trates the sufficiency of faith in the Messiah. By this he means a *religious* belief that Christ is indeed the Messiah, that is, a divinely commissioned messenger of God. The consequences of this would be a belief and practice of his instructions.

“Consider then, the natural operation and direct tendency of this principle. One believes, sincerely and religiously, that Jesus is the Christ, the son of God. Now I ask, is it possible for him to stop here, and no consequences to follow? If he do not believe it sincerely and religiously—if he take it only as any other historical truth, but not as having more concern with himself than the fact that Alexander was a conqueror, or Xerxes a king of Persia, then undoubtedly he may stop at the barren assent. But if, as I said, he believe it sincerely and religiously, is it not impossible that he should rest here? For what is implied in such a belief? A belief in God, the Supreme Governor and Father, who had for ages spoken of that Messiah by his prophets, and whose purposes he was sent to fulfil—a belief in his character, authority, purposes, and will as the moral ruler of men—a belief that all the instruction of Jesus rests on the authority of God, and a consequent reception of whatever he teaches, as the true doctrine of religion; a belief that the way of acceptance and life is revealed by him, and that to disregard and disobey him, is to disregard the authority of God, and to subject ourselves to his displeasure to whom we are accountable at last. The mind of him who RELIGIOUSLY believes that Jesus is the Christ, cannot escape these consequences. They are momentous, they are affecting, they are practical consequences. They touch the springs of action, they agitate him with hope and fear, they teach him that he has an infinite interest at stake, they make him anxious for his eternal destiny. He feels that here he is bound by obligations which cannot be broken; that there is but one path left him, that of implicit submission to the instructions of this heavenly messenger, and a life of devotion, repentance, and holiness. Since it were an insane inconsistency, to acknowledge this powerful truth, and yet live disregard-

ful of its authority and uninfluenced by its requisitions.” pp. 54, 55.

But it is clear that faith in the Messiah, as our author understands it, is faith in his doctrines; and it is equally plain that his declarations are not to be received because they are *his*, but because they are God's; that is, we do not trust in him, but in God's assertions communicated to us by him; and all the power ascribed by our author to faith in the Messiah rests solely upon this consideration; as the messenger of God, he has revealed truths which can change the soul and transform the character, and if we receive the messenger and believe his instructions, we shall become Christians, and overcome the world by faith—faith in eternal realities.

Nor does he go beyond this when, in the fourth discourse, he considers his character as Mediator. The amount of what he says, is this:—God in his intercourse with men, does not approach them directly, but uses intervening agents. So in communicating the Christian religion, he spake to us by Christ, who thus became a mediator, that is, a medium of communication between God and man: and in executing this office, he communicates the messages of God to man, and teaches man how to hold intercourse with God; and to pray *in the name* of Christ, or *through Christ*, is thus explained:

“So also in the instance of prayer *through Christ*, we may understand *through his religion*, or doctrine; since it is entirely through the influence of his religion, its instructions, directions, encouragements, and promises, that we are enabled to worship God acceptably. It is these which prepare our minds, and lead us to the mercy seat. We approach because the instructions which Jesus has given, and on which our faith relies, guide us thither. That is to say, as before, we come as *his disciples*, under his authority, and by faith in him.

It is this coming in the character of his disciples, which gives us hope that we shall be heard." p. 83.

In the fifth discourse, entitled 'Jesus the Saviour,' we are informed, that he saves his people from ignorance, sin, and misery, by the power of the truth which he communicated. He has organized a system of moral influence which reforms, and elevates, and purifies, the character of man.

In the sixth discourse, entitled, 'Jesus the High Priest,' the author supposes that Christ is called high priest because he exerts a moral influence on the characters of men, by his doctrines and sufferings; and that he is said strictly to put away sin, when he reforms a sinner by moral suasion, and in a more popular and figurative sense, when he indicates by the sign or emblem of his own death, that God is willing to forgive transgression. But the language of the Bible on this subject is so strong, that the author could not feel fully satisfied with this view of the subject, and is compelled to make the following remarkable concession:

"That there is no other efficacy in our Lord's sufferings, except in the mode which has now been described, I do not assert. But thus much is clear—that this is the only operation which we can understand, or with which we can perceive that man has any practical concern. In the mind and counsels of God, there may be consequences which we do not discern and cannot penetrate. An importance is plainly attributed to the Messiah's death in the scriptures, which is ascribed to that of no other person. It is spoken of with peculiar emphasis and feeling, and is connected in a peculiar manner with the terms of pardon and life. We may therefore be certain that it holds a most important place in the Christian scheme, that we owe to it, perhaps, much more than we can at present know, far more than we can distinctly apprehend. But what we can apprehend, what we do understand, should be enough to satisfy us. 'The secret

things belong unto the Lord our God;' it is not for us curiously to pry into them, nor should we perhaps be made better if we could discover them. What God has been pleased to reveal, is enough for our gratitude, guidance, and peace. True humility will be content with this, and not ambitiously seek to explain what the scriptures have not explained. If we can discern the powerful moral operation by which our Lord's death convinces men of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, and sanctifies their souls; it is enough, or more would have been told. Let us be content to rest in humble ignorance of whatever mysterious purposes may be otherwise effected, and fear lest our solicitude to know more should destroy the practical and saving influence of what is already certain." pp. 120—122.

The author does not deny that the atoning sacrifice of Christ *may* be a measure, tending to sustain law whilst God pardons transgression, but he is content to remain ignorant, whether this be the fact or not; nay, more, he asserts that the moral influence of the death of Christ on the character of the sinner, is the only thing worthy of attention, and that nothing more is revealed. Of course he does limit the agency of Christ as a priest to the exertion of moral influence on the character of men, while at the same time, he acknowledges that the language of the Bible on the death of Christ is very peculiar.

The amount therefore of all his discourses thus far, is, *that Christ, as the messenger of God, reveals truth, by which, and by his own example, he sanctifies men.* In the seventh discourse, on the Atonement, corresponding views are exhibited.—To atone, is to reconcile. And since men have alienated themselves from God, they must be reconciled and restored to holiness and obedience; and as Christ restores them by the moral influence of the truth, he is said to make atonement for them; especially has his death a powerful moral influence in producing repentance and

faith, and "therefore to this portion of his ministration the work of reconciliation is frequently attributed."

In the eighth discourse, he illustrates the agency of Christ as intercessor, which consists briefly in this. He remembers and loves his disciples, and prays for them as he did on earth, and as any good man prays for the Church; only as he is more intimately connected with the Church than any other man, and is more holy and more highly exalted, so we may suppose that his intercessions are peculiarly ardent, and powerful.

In his discourse on the agency of Christ as Judge of the world, he alludes to the probability of his being so called because he has disclosed those principles and doctrines in accordance with which men will be judged. But he rather inclines to the opinion that Christ will act as judge by delegated authority and knowledge, and affirms that we are not competent to assert that the delegation of such authority and knowledge to a finite mind as shall qualify him to judge the world, is impossible.

In his tenth discourse, on honouring the Son, he asserts that the honour due to Christ, arises from his official relation to us, and from his moral character, but not from his nature. If we dishonour him, we dishonour God's ambassador, and of course, God himself. If we receive and honour him because he is God's ambassador, if we believe and obey his communications, if we admire his holiness, are grateful for his efforts in our behalf, and imitate his example, then we honour the Son even as we honour the Father. And all curious inquiries as to his nature and essential attributes are needless and useless. Yet according to our author, he is not to be worshipped, in the highest sense of the word; and the plain inference from this is, that he is not God, that he has

not a divine nature, or at least, that the existence of such a nature has not been revealed. This, as we have before remarked, is in fact a decision of the question which he professes to avoid.

The eleventh and last discourse, on the example of our Lord, is well written, and well illustrated. The author alludes to the power of example, and following the usual course, specifies the moral qualities of our Saviour; such as his love, meekness, patience, resignation, &c.; and applies them to the formation of our own moral character, and to the direction of our conduct. But he of course omits that most wonderful act of Christ, the tendency of which, St. Paul delighted to illustrate. 'Ye know,' says that ardent apostle, 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, how that although he was rich, yet for our sakes he became poor, that we through his poverty might become rich:' and again, 'let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God, yet humbled himself,' &c.

Such is an outline of Mr. W. on this subject; the tendency of his views next demands our attention. We remark in the first place that they tend to produce erroneous views in regard to the inspiration of the scriptures. Though this may not at first be obvious, yet a little reflection will convince us that such is the fact. For according to these views, almost the entire dignity and honour of Christ arise from his being the medium of communicating divine truth to man. Yet one would naturally inquire, wherein does this distinguish him from other inspired men? Has no other man ever declared the will of God? It must be shown that Christ is the only inspired source of truth, or that the truths which he communicated were peculiarly important and certain, or else his pre-eminence as a teacher, must be

given up: he has no superiority over other divinely authorized teachers, and all the declamation which is so frequent on this subject is groundless. There is a propensity among Unitarians to elevate the teaching of Christ and to depreciate that of the apostles and prophets. Yet what can be more inconsistent, even on their own principles, for do not they acknowledge that the teaching of Christ is valuable only because it is in fact the teaching of God by him? And cannot God, if he please, teach us by other men, and that infallibly? And if so, how shall we dare to place one part of God's communications above another? Has not God in fact taught us by other men; did not Christ declare, that he had many things to say which his disciples were not yet prepared to receive, and which the Holy Spirit should afterwards reveal to them; and did he not say that the Holy Spirit should guide them *into all truth*? And did not the apostles claim that they spake the words of God; and did not God by miracles sanction their claim? Especially, did not St. Paul, in repeated instances, and in the most unequivocal manner, declare that he spake under the influences of the Holy Spirit; that his doctrines were not the doctrines of men, but of God; and that he who despised him despised God?

And what stronger evidence have we that Christ was inspired? His own assertions, sanctioned by miracles, rendered him worthy of credit, and shall we doubt the full and ample inspiration of his apostles, founded on the same evidence? As to the Old Testament, we are willing to receive as the word of God which cannot be broken, that which was thus received by our Saviour and his apostles, and which is supported by the combined evidence of miracles, prophecy, and its own internal excellence. Yet we should infer from the lan-

guage of Mr. W. that he believed Christ to be the only inspired messenger of God whom the world has ever seen. What less is implied by such passages as these?

"Jesus called himself, 'the Light of the world;' and he is truly the fountain and depository of whatever light we possess on the great subject of religion. There is to us, strictly and properly speaking, no other. We know nothing on the subject, clearly and certainly, but what we learn from him, or have been enabled to attain in consequence of what he has taught us. It is true that we gather something of the existence, attributes, and providence of God from the works of nature; but how little should we be able to do it, without the aid of revelation? We find the great principles of morality and accountableness in 'the law written on our hearts;' but it is our previous acquaintance with the Christian revelation, which enables us to see them so distinctly there, and they have been very obscurely discerned by those who have not the benefit of this aid. We might learn something also from the great human lights, which have adorned and instructed the world in all ages; but not enough, amidst their own vague and contradictory notions, to be a sure and satisfactory guide. For it is certain, that however great the wisdom of the world may have been, still 'the world by wisdom knew not God.'

"What man might be capable of learning under any circumstances, from his own unassisted inquiry, it were unprofitable to discuss. All history declares the plain and incontrovertible fact, that by his own unassisted inquiry he has learned comparatively nothing. The certainty and definiteness of the very first principles, he owes to the instruction of Jesus; and if he have added any thing by his own efforts, it is because he has built upon this foundation, and been guided by this light. Who knows any thing of God, 'but the Son, and he to whom the Son has revealed him?' Who understands any thing of the purposes of the divine will, but they who have received it from Jesus? Look over the history of the world, Brethren; in former and in present times, in Christian and in pagan lands:—where do you find religious knowledge, and from what fountains does it flow?

Do you not trace all its streams to Nazareth? Do you not find every beam emanating from the Star of Bethlehem? And is not every region dark and unwatered, which these do not visit? Look also to your own minds, and consider whether you possess any valuable knowledge concerning God, any certain and satisfactory truth, any sustaining and peace-giving acquaintance with things invisible and future, which is not derived from the Christian doctrine. And will you not say, then, with earnest faith, 'Lord to whom should we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.' pp. 19—21.

What now shall we say of the Old Testament;—that it is a part of the revelation made by Christ? This would be confounding language for no purpose. Or shall we say that we can learn nothing clearly and certainly from that portion of the word of God; that no ray of light flows from its pages to illuminate the darkness of man? Let us remember that the Old Testament is that volume in reference to which St. Paul has said, all scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be *perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works*. Let us remember that Jesus himself constantly referred his disciples and his enemies to this volume as to the voice of God; let us remember the delight of ancient saints in meditating on its pages; let us read the glowing language of the 19th and 119th Psalms respecting the excellency and power of the scriptures, and remember that but a small part even of the Old Testament was then in existence, and we shall be convinced that they who depreciate those sacred writings, differ no less from Christ, his apostles, and ancient saints, than from reason and incontestible evidence.

But perhaps our author will say that he meant only that we have no light except from revelation. If so, he is unhappy in his language; for that asserts that we know no-

thing on the subject clearly and certainly, but what we learn from Christ, or have been enabled to attain in consequence of what he has taught us. Now if this is so, either the Old Testament is a part of Christ's teaching, or it is of no value.

But Mr. Ware intimates that the instructions of all other inspired writers are imperfect—partaking more or less of the defects of the writers; or to use his own language:

"The teaching of Jesus must be regarded as the fountain of Christian truth. The instructions of others, are but streams flowing from it; some nearer the source, and some more distant from it; but all likely to be more or less affected by the character of the channel which conveys them, and the soil through which they pass. Even the words of the apostles are not to be taken before those of Christ. For to them the spirit was given by measure, to him 'without measure.' The treasure in them was in 'earthen vessels,' and they 'knew but in part' The spirit preserved them from injurious errors in communicating and recording the truth; but still they are not to be put on a level with their infallible master, nor their epistles to be esteemed and admired beyond his discourses." p. 14.

Here it is natural to ask, *cannot* God enable an inspired writer, even though imperfect and sinful, to speak perfect and unmixed truth? And has he not done it? If not, then all hope is at an end; for be it remembered, we have nothing on record which Jesus himself wrote. Every book in the Bible was written *by sinful men*. It will perhaps be said that the evangelists heard the discourses of our Lord and derived their knowledge from the fountain head. But we ask, can this be asserted of them all? And if it could, who can tell how much they misunderstood or misremembered? Were they not, as Unitarians are wont to remark, ignorant, and clouded with prejudice, and unable to comprehend all the

instructions of our Lord, even during his life? Whence all their wisdom after his death? Did the Holy Spirit teach them and call to their remembrance the words of Christ? We believe that he did. And did he enable them to write truth, pure and unmixed as it flowed from its divine source, truth which they would neither have remembered nor understood but for his inspiration? We believe that he did. And do not Unitarians believe it? If not, what infallible truth have we? If they do, why do they not concede to the apostles what they concede to the evangelists, and admit that the Holy Spirit taught them infallibly; and why, when they assert themselves to have been so taught, and prove the assertion by miracles, should we doubt their word? Or why are we to doubt the inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament, of whom St. Peter asserts that they spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. We do not hesitate to say that there is not the shadow of a reason for making this distinction between one part of the Bible and another. It is like exalting the authority of God above the authority of God; for one and the self same Spirit spake by all, and with equal truth at all times.

Nor is it true, as our author asserts, that the mercy and clemency of God were revealed by Christ alone. He makes this one reason why Christ is called "the foundation."

"We may say once more, Christ is the only foundation of the *believer's* hope. It is from him and his gospel, that we learn those truths concerning the mercy and placability of God, which give hope of pardon on repentance, and of acceptance in our imperfect attempts to please him;—from him alone, also, that we derive sufficient assurance of a future life, and an existence of eternal purity and peace." pp. 24, 25.

"It is the message of Jesus Christ, which has taught the grace of Almighty God; which has proclaimed his long suffering and compassion; which has encouraged sinners to repent and return by invitations of forgiving love; which has declared the kind allowance of our Father for unavoidable imperfection, and thus given courage to human weakness. It is this only, which proclaims to a world lying in wickedness, that 'God hath not appointed it to wrath, but to obtain salvation through the Lord Jesus Christ:' and 'hath sent his Son into the world, not to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved.'" p. 25.

Has the author never read the Old Testament; or does he really and wholly deny its inspiration? Who does not know that God's mercy is as fully revealed in the Old Testament as in the New? And if glow of language, frequency of repetition, and variety of illustration can add to the fulness of revelation, it is even more fully revealed in the Old Testament than in the New. If any one doubts it, let him read the Psalms and Isaiah, and in short all the Old Testament. One thing Christ did, as we believe, which threw a flood of light on this subject. He showed *how* God could be merciful and yet just, by his atoning death. But the *fact* that God would pardon he could not reveal: it had been known for ages and generations before.

Mr. W. also asserts that the epistles are of more limited application than the instructions of Christ; and that Jesus had in general a wider reference to all who should, in any age, believe in him.

"Even the words of the apostles are not to be taken before those of Christ. For to them the spirit was given by measure, to him 'without measure.' The treasure in them was in 'earthen vessels,' and they 'knew but in part.' The spirit preserved them from injuri-

ous errors in communicating and recording the truth; but still they are not to be put on a level with their infallible master, nor their epistles to be esteemed and admired beyond his discourses. They wrote for particular churches, on special occasions, oftentimes on subjects of temporary interest and questions of controversy, now settled and forgotten: and this it is, which makes some passages in their writings so hard to be understood. Jesus, on the other hand, though adapting himself to present circumstances, yet had in general a wider reference to all who should in any age believe on him. He was laying the foundation of a temple for all people, while the disciples were building upon it for particular communities. Hence he is more easily and generally understood, and his teaching is more universally applicable. Not that the epistles are to be in any degree undervalued—for there are large portions of them still of universal and most important application. I only mean, we are to bear it in mind that he is the master of the apostles, no less than of ourselves; and that we are safest in deriving the first principles of our faith from his own lips and life, and then interpreting the apostles accordingly. And this is our duty—not only because, as I said, he is our master and not they—but because, also, a great part of the perplexing and unhappy consequences arising from unintelligible and superstitious doctrine, and from misapprehension of scripture, have sprung from this very source—the leaning on the apostles instead of on Jesus—the learning Christianity from their obscure discussions of particular questions at Rome or Corinth, or Galatia, instead of taking it from the plain exposition of their master, who spoke for the edification of all men, in all ages, and under all circumstances. We shall avoid a great evil by going directly to him, first of all.” pp. 14—16.

All this, we think, requires proof. No one, to our knowledge, ever maintained that the words of the apostles are to be taken *before* those of Christ; but we have yet to learn that the communications of the self same Spirit vary in authority in different parts of the Bible. For our author seems con-

stantly to forget that *men* are not our authority in any part of the Bible. In regard to the epistles, we believe that in extent of application they have a superiority over the gospels, rather than the reverse; and that even where local questions arose, they were always settled on principles of universal application. And the circumstances are so far from obscuring these principles, that they tend rather to render them more definite. No principles are of more universal application than those of Christian expediency illustrated in St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians; where the propriety of eating meat in an idol's temple is discussed. True, that question was of “temporary interest,” and is now “settled and forgotten; yet so far is it from obscuring the principles of the subject, that it gives them a definiteness and a clearness which nothing can evade. We always understand principles better by seeing them actually applied to existing cases, than by any abstract statement. The same remarks are applicable to other questions of local interest, discussed by the apostles, the principles of which are unlimited and universal. But on the whole, the epistles have as little that is local, as any part of the Bible, and they are the only part of the Bible where we have connected and systematic views of Christian doctrine prepared for all mankind, and unembarrassed by the peculiar nature of the Jewish economy. The Old Testament clearly revealed all the attributes of God, and either by types, prophecies, or direct declaration, most of the peculiarities of the Christian system, as well as all the grand principles of religion and morality. The Saviour came *principally*, as we believe, to fulfil what was predicted of him as an atoning sacrifice. He taught more clearly all the doctrines of Christianity as far as the statement of facts is concerned, not

explaining fully the mode, or the connexion of all which he revealed; but he stated that the whole subject would be more fully made known at the advent of the Holy Spirit. Accordingly we have in the Epistles not only the same doctrinal facts which we have in the Old Testament and the Gospels, but we have more of the *theory* of the subject. We see how the proceedings of God can be referred to general and sublime principles of moral government; how they are connected with each other, and in union tend to one grand result. And this, we apprehend, is one reason why they are so unpopular with many. It is much easier to explain away insulated statements, than a connected chain of reasoning. We think it impossible for any man to pervert or wrest St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans with any decent degree of plausibility. So clear are his statements, so closely connected are his arguments, that the shortest way of evading the difficulty is to dismiss him as "hard to be understood," or else to diminish his authority as an inspired writer; and many bitter complaints are uttered because men will derive their doctrinal ideas from St. Paul. But who shall dictate to the Sovereign of the universe by whom and when he shall most fully reveal doctrines? And who can complain if we derive our doctrines from that part of the Bible which *professes to be doctrinal*. Would it not be ridiculous to censure a man because he consulted the Book of Proverbs to obtain prudential maxims, instead of going to the Apocalypse? If we wish to know the system of doctrines in all its connexions, and the philosophy of the whole subject, we must go where they are to be found, and not where we imagine they *ought* to be found. Besides; it is reasonable, and in accordance with analogy, that the last revelation should be the most clear.

Christ spoke to the Jews, under their peculiar economy, and before the distinction between Jew and Gentile was abolished. The apostles, and particularly Paul, spoke to the Gentiles, explained the abolition of the old dispensation, the union of Jews and Gentiles in one church, and the universal principles of that dispensation which was to include the whole world. In fact the Epistles are composed with express reference to the Christian dispensation, and are in this respect peculiar and more *immediately* applicable to us than any other part of the Bible. But so long as all scripture is given by inspiration of God, we are not inclined to elevate the authority of one part of the Bible above that of another: but rather to interpret the whole fairly, and to receive with faith whatever we find, in what part soever it may be revealed.

All this unsoundness with regard to inspiration is a natural consequence of endeavouring to make the dignity of Christ rest upon his official relation to us as a teacher. For if it is once conceded that the communications of others are as authoritative and ample as those of the man Christ Jesus, this ground of distinction fails, and we must explain the lofty language of the Bible on another hypothesis.

The views of Mr. W. tend in the second place, to destroy all faith in Christ, in any proper sense of the word. We cannot confide in him for his own sake, as God; and merely to believe his communications is not faith in him; for on this ground we might with equal propriety speak of faith in St. Paul, or St. John. The only alternative here, as before, is to maintain that Jesus Christ is the only inspired teacher, and that we are to believe him alone; whereas, according to what has been shown, we have nothing which has come to us directly by Christ, but all our knowledge has been communicated by other in-

spired writers. Of course, on this scheme, there is no such thing as faith in Christ, in the proper sense of the word, or in any peculiar sense whatever.

Thirdly: According to these views, we have as many mediators as there are inspired writers. For there is nothing in the character of a mediator, as described by Mr. Ware, peculiar to Christ; since other men have been the organs of communication between God and us, and have taught us how to approach God. We may therefore speak of the mediation of St. Paul with as much propriety as of that of Christ. The only alternative is still therefore, as before, to maintain that Christ is the only infallible teacher whom God has sent; that is, to deny or limit the inspiration of the other sacred writers. And if merely the moral influence of Jesus as a teacher make him our Saviour and high priest, then we have other Saviours and high priests besides him; and if the moral influence of his death in "affecting the souls of men and restoring them to the love of duty and of God," renders it an atoning sacrifice, then we have had more than one atoning sacrifice; for the sufferings and death of other inspired writers have without doubt had similar effects. And if the death of Christ had power to sanction and establish his doctrines, so had that of other sacred writers; for many of them sealed their doctrines with their blood.

It is this which draws from our author the unwilling confession that the death of Christ may operate in some way unknown to us,—which he immediately neutralizes by saying that on this subject nothing is revealed, and that it is the reforming influence only, of the death of Christ, with which we have any concern. Much easier would it have been to say with Paul, that the death of Christ *enables God to be just*, and the justi-

fier of him who believeth in Jesus. Then there would have been a broad and obvious distinction between the death of Christ and that of any other man: but as our author limits the subject, no such distinction is apparent.

Again, fourthly: Our obligations of love and gratitude to Christ are weakened by this view of his character. It is right that we should be grateful to all our benefactors, and not to concentrate all our gratitude on him, as though we had received the messages of God through him alone; or as though he alone had suffered in the cause of truth. And besides, if he was a mere man, and was never in a more exalted state, his efforts in our behalf, to say the least, are not in any degree more striking than those of other men. For he had before him a glorious reward, an exaltation above that of any other man who has laboured and suffered in the same cause. If we say with Paul that, though equal with God, he humbled himself and took the form of a servant, that he might atone for sin, the scene at once changes, and language becomes powerless to express the height and depth and length and breadth of the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge. But what does this language mean on the Unitarian hypothesis?

Fifthly: According to these views, we see not how Christ can find any place in our prayers. For we cannot pray *to him*, nor ask any thing *for his sake*, since according to Mr. W. this is unscriptural; and to pray *in his name*, is only to pray according to his directions, and by his authority. Now can we not in this sense assign to St. Paul, in our prayers, the same place which we do to Christ, and pray in his name, that is, according to his instructions and by his authority? Or shall we say, as before, that he is not an inspired writer?

But who that has any just views

of the nature of prayer can think of finite beings like these, in his supplications before the infinite and eternal God. On this subject, many Unitarians are, to say the least, consistent, for in their prayers no conspicuous place is found even for the name of the Saviour of men. And this is what we should expect; for let any one who is accustomed to worship Christ, for a moment entertain the thought that he is not God, and how does his mind instantaneously recoil from his worship, and lose sight of him in the presence of the eternal God. There is no compromise; we must either pray to Christ, or he is at once a created being like ourselves, and utterly insignificant, when compared with the God of all power and might.

But how do these views and their tendency correspond with the glowing language of the Bible? On one hand we are told that Christ is a messenger of God, whom we must believe and imitate, who has done much for us, and who therefore deserves much gratitude. But when Paul enters upon this theme, what ardour, what vehemence, does he manifest. No hesitation, no ambiguity, no lukewarm admiration, characterizes him. His mind and his style kindle together, and the mighty flood of emotion bears him onward, regardless of the barriers of rhetoric or of rule. Do Unitarians ever, by chance, fall into this current? are they heard exclaiming with him, I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of my Lord Jesus Christ; For me to live is Christ; I have a desire to depart and be with Christ; God forbid that I should glory save in the cross of Christ? If we had a moral thermometer, we doubt not that the ardour of language used by the advocates of different systems would in most cases be found to correspond with their views of the native and original dignity of Christ.

When he is degraded to the rank of a mere creature, there is a philosophical gratitude, and a distant and calm admiration, which seem to cause but little agitation of soul or fervency of language. Never is the soul overwhelmed with unspeakable emotion; never is it lost in the ocean of love, as it gazes on his humiliation, who left his throne on high, and the glory which he had with the Father before the world was, to make atonement for the sins of his revolted creatures,—creatures not merely ignorant, or unfortunate, but deeply plunged in guilt and voluntary ruin. If we look at the sermon on ‘honouring the Son as we honour the Father,’ we shall find that, in principle, it amounts to no more than this: render unto Jesus the things which are his, and unto God the things which are God’s—and if we are to honour him only as the anointed messenger of God, and to love him only as a holy being, and according to his excellence, and if we are to be grateful only for his official communications and acts, we see not why other inspired messengers are not also to be honoured in the same way. If they bring the messages of God, they must be received as his ambassadors; if they are our benefactors, we ought to be grateful to them; if they are morally excellent, we ought to love and imitate them according to their excellence; in the words of St. Paul, we should be followers of them who through faith and patience inherit the promises; and we should believe and obey their instructions. Unless, therefore, Mr. W. takes the ground, that there are no inspired men besides Christ, we see not how he can avoid the conclusion that we are to honour them also even as we honour the Father. Not indeed in the same degree, nor are we to honour Christ in the same degree: but we are to honour them according to their moral character, and their relation to

us, just as in the case of our Lord Jesus.

The light in which these sermons exhibit Christ as Judge, gives him comparatively little pre-eminence. Mr. Ware supposes it not improbable that he will judge the world by delegated knowledge. We think that there is but one conceivable mode in which a finite being can be enabled to judge the world. God can form his own decisions, communicate them to the nominal judge, and by him make them known to the world. At the same time, he who pronounces the sentence must be ignorant of the grounds on which it rests, and can be certain of its rectitude only by implicit faith in God, the real Judge. But to exercise judgment of this secondary kind requires no peculiar wisdom, for any one can pronounce a just sentence, if he is required merely to repeat the decisions of another. If Mr. Ware is disposed to maintain that a finite being can be qualified to exercise judgment in a higher sense, so as to form independent decisions, in the exercise of his own powers; we must reply that it seems to us impossible, that the acts, words, and thoughts, of all mankind, together with all the attending circumstances of palliation or aggravation, and their connexions with the interests of the government of God, in all past and future ages, should be viewed by a finite mind as they are by the infinite God. And yet can an impartial and independent sentence be pronounced by one whose views are limited in any of these respects.

The whole tendency of the views exhibited in these sermons, is to enervate the Bible, to diminish the force of language, limit its extent, and quench its ardour. If any one should attempt to accommodate a splendid description of the sun, to a taper, he would seem to us to labour much as those who attempt to accommodate the elevated language of the Bible respecting Christ to

any mere finite being. Particular passages may be evaded or neutralized by criticism but the glory of Christ shines with too much splendour from the pages of the Bible, to suffer dim eclipse by efforts like these.

As a literary production, the work is creditable to the author. The spirit manifested is generally candid and fair: we would believe that the author designed to be so in all cases. Yet either ignorantly or unconsciously, he has occasionally introduced passages too much characterized by insinuation and innuendo. He exhibits marks of an amiable, serious, and grateful temper of mind, but is deficient in that deep, ardent, and energetic feeling, which the theme of his discourses would seem fitted to inspire.

Wicked men ensnared by themselves. A Sermon preached, Dec. 16, 1825, in the Second Parish of West Springfield, at the interment of Samuel Leonard, and Mrs. Harriet Leonard, his wife; the former of whom murdered the latter, and then committed Suicide. With an appendix, &c. By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, Pastor of the first Church in West Springfield.

THE occasion of this sermon was one of the most awfully impressive upon record. A man who had been distinguished for his malignant opposition to religion, and for the profession of a belief in the doctrine of universal salvation, had deliberately, and with every appearance of sanity which the case could admit, murdered his wife, and then himself, in the presence of their children. The sermon was well adapted to the occasion. It is not an effort at a popular oration. It shows nothing which looks like an attempt to move the human passions of the vast multitude in whose hearing it was uttered. The circumstances of horror were left to produce their own effect, while the preacher availed himself of that effect to impress upon the minds of his hearers, first "some of the means by which a pre-eminently depraved character is formed;" and secondly, the fact that "wicked

ed men, in their efforts to injure others and oppose religion, actually ensnare themselves."

We have room for only a single extract.

"I observe, once more, that there is nothing, which is more likely to constitute the foundation, or to accelerate the progress of a grossly depraved habit, than a belief in the doctrine of universal salvation.

"There is no idea so terrible, as that of a punishment, such as the Bible describes, to be the portion of the wicked, in a future world. It is this, which, in a great degree, prevents depraved man from acting out the native madness of the heart. No doubt, it has a powerful influence even upon Christians; but in respect to those, who are destitute of a principle of holy love, it imposes one of the chief restraints against a life of open transgression. We find this principle operating, with no small efficacy, even upon the minds of heathen; but where it has been quickened and directed by revelation, it exerts a proportionably greater energy.

"If it be true, then, that the dread of a future retribution is one of the most efficient principles, in the prevention of crime, it is manifest that they, who would root out this sentiment from the mind, level a deadly blow at the best interests of society. Only let a wicked man believe, that all distinctions of character will be overlooked, in a future world, and that the good and the bad will share alike, in the rewards of eternity, and no exhibition of depravity whatever, from such a man, furnishes any reasonable ground of surprise. The highest principle, by which you can expect that he will be governed, is expediency. His only inquiry will be, what, on the whole, will most promote his present gratification; and even the answer to this inquiry will be suggested by passion and appetite, rather than by sober reason. Suppose, then, that he cast his eye covetously upon your property; if he really believe that an act of theft will no more be punished, in a future world, than an act of charity, what is there, provided he can evade the vigilance of human law, to keep him from his purpose. The truth is, that the creed of the atheist does not so effectually undermine the foundations of morality, as this; for while the atheist hopes and professes to believe, that man will not exist in a future state, he is obliged upon his own principles, to admit the possibility, not only of a future existence, but of an interminable existence in misery. He knows no other god than chance; and to this he ascribes every thing. How then can he know, that the same chance, which has begun his existence here, may not continue it for ever; that the same chance, which dooms him, in the present life, to a degree of suffering, may not, hereafter, place him in circumstances, in which he will experience nothing but suffering. But the creed of the universalist, though it avoids the fundamental article of atheism—a probable non-existence, does not, like atheism, admit even the possibility of an eternal and just retribution. It not only

makes provision to save the most hardened wretch, but it lays him under the necessity of being saved; it does not even give him the privilege of choice. Better, I verily believe, for society, that the wicked man should read over the door of the tomb, **DEATH, AN ETERNAL SLEEP, than UNIVERSAL and UNCONDITIONAL SALVATION.**

"Why is it that the doctrine, of which I am speaking, makes so conspicuous a figure, in the annals of suicide? It is because the universalist reasons, in the manner which might be expected, from his own principles. Why not suffer a little pain, in order to stop the vital current, when, the moment the work is done, the glories of heaven are bursting upon the soul? If it were possible that such an act should awaken the displeasure of Him, who gave life, it is not possible, on this principle, that that displeasure should ever be expressed; for that would be inconsistent with the idea, that all beyond the grave is happiness. But surely, a God, who desires so much the happiness of his creatures, that he can save the most abandoned of them, in their sins, will not be offended, if, by a self-destroying act, they shorten a little the path to heaven; especially, if they are destined here to a heavy burden of affliction. And this doctrine, I venture to say, furnishes as fair a warrant, and opens as bright a path, to the murderer, as the suicide; for if death be the gate of glory to all, the man who sheds your blood, be your character what it may, confers upon you the highest favour; and the shedding of his blood, by the hand of justice, instead of being a punishment, is a premium upon murder. If you will punish a criminal, on this principle, try to detain him in this world as long as you can; but do not make him a thousand fold happier than yourselves, by sending him instantly to glory."

pp. 16—18.

The Value of the Soul. A Sermon, preached, December 28th, 1825, at the Ordination of Mr. James D. Knowles, as Pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Boston. By IRAH CHASE, Professor of Biblical Theology in the Newton Theological Institution. Boston.

THE text is Matthew xvi. 26.; *What is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul? or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul?* The value of the soul is argued from its capacity of knowledge,—from its capacity of enjoyment,—from its immortality,—and from the price of its redemption.

The discourse is, on the whole, unpretending, and yet impressive. It leaves upon the mind, not so much an impression of the author's intellectual

power, as a conviction that the soul of man is precious.

The style is for the most part simple and correct. If we were disposed to be critical, we might say that the poetical quotation on page 9th reads as if it were brought in on purpose; that the story of Archimedes, however he may plead Robert Hall's authority for introducing it in a sermon, is too trite to interest a scholar, and bears too much the aspect of college learning to produce an impression on a common audience; and that the eulogy on Commodore Macdonough—though he makes a good use of it, is so abruptly introduced as to make the reader stare. But the reader who finds in a sermon such paragraphs as the following, will say with us,—“*Non paucis offendar maculis.*”

“The immense value of the soul appears thus from its capacity of enjoyment, as well as from its capacity of knowledge. But it will appear in a still more striking manner when we consider, thirdly,

“ITS IMMORTALITY.

“You have just been reflecting on its capacities of knowing and enjoying. Consider now the impediments which exist in the present world, removed, and these capacities filled, and expanding, and filled FOR EVER. What inconceivable value do you stamp upon the soul! . . . FOR EVER, FOR EVER AND EVER.

“You have just heard of some of the joys of which she was capable on earth, and of the song which she commenced. She enters the regions of a blissful immortality. ‘The righteous shall enter into life eternal.’ She strikes her harp anew. She sings her victory through Jesus Christ, over death and the world of despair. She associates with kindred spirits. She joins the throng of the redeemed ‘before the throne, and before the Lamb.’ She sees constantly more and more of the wisdom and glory of Jehovah; and she unites in the general ascription of ‘Salvation unto our God which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb.’—‘Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth. Ten thousand ages roll away, and still all heaven resounds, ‘Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.’ Ten thousand times ten thousand ages roll away, unfolding new glories as they roll, and still the song is raised with increasing rapture, ‘Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth.’”

pp. 12, 13.

Our Baptist brethren have been very silent in the work of building their “Newton Theological Institution.” We were very happy to learn—and it was the first distinct intelligence which we had on the subject—that it has been opened for students, and is under the care of two such men as Mr.

Chase and Mr. Wayland. We bid them God-speed; and we pray that all the Baptist churches in our land, under the liberalizing influence of a well instructed ministry, may soon be delivered from the bondage of sectarian feelings, and turning from disputations about *divers washings*, may gird themselves to sustain their part in the great conflict for the faith once delivered to the saints.

—
Evangelical Preaching is rational Preaching. A Sermon, delivered Nov. 2, 1825, at the Ordination of the Rev. William K. Talbot, as Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Nottingham-west. By DANIEL DANA, D. D. Pastor of a Church in Londonderry. Concord, N. H.

THE object which the preacher had principally in view, on this occasion, was to show that the doctrines of the Bible perfectly accord with the dictates of sound reason. Discussions of this kind, he remarks, are never useless; but they are peculiarly demanded at a period “when unwearied efforts are employed to persuade us that doctrines undeniably found in the scriptures are at war with common sense.”

“While some claim for a system which rejects all that is most essential and characteristic in the gospel, the imposing character of *rational* Christianity, let us, occasionally at least, meet them on their own ground, and with their own weapons. While we have the honour to share with the great and good apostle in the charge of enthusiasm and madness, let us humbly plead his privilege, of showing that we are not mad, but speak the words of soberness, as well as of truth.” p. 7.

The time would allow the preacher to notice only a few of the doctrines referred to, and he selected those which were most obnoxious to the charge in view. He begins with the doctrine of *human depravity*; and shows that this doctrine is every where conspicuous on the face of the Bible: it pervades the whole volume. It is so intimately blended with the whole plan of the gospel, that, “if you take it away, the whole system is marred, its beautiful features are distorted, and all its magnificent provisions appear a useless and empty parade.” And this doc-

trine is supported by human testimony. If you deny it, you also deny facts which the whole world admits.

"Is this doctrine contrary to fact and to common sense? Let it then be proved, that histories deemed the most authentic, are mere libels on an innocent and injured race. Let it be proved, that in our daily observations on passing events, our senses egregiously deceive us. Let it be proved, that legislators and magistrates have, for some thousands of years, been gravely employed in removing evils which did not exist. Let it be proved, that thousands of wicked men have, on their dying beds, grossly traduced their own characters; and that thousands of the best and wisest of men have, in their daily confessions, uttered the language of fanaticism, or hypocrisy. Let it likewise be proved, that mankind at large have ever been much disposed to love God with all their hearts, to serve him in spirit and in truth, to love their fellow-creatures as themselves, to subdue their sensual appetites, to prefer a heavenly to an earthly treasure; and to spend this transient life in a constant and solicitous preparation for the world to come. When this object is accomplished, then, and not till then, will the doctrine of human depravity be effectually exploded." pp. 7, 8.

Dr. D. next considers the doctrine of *regeneration* and the necessity of a *divine influence* to effect it. If man is thus wholly and universally depraved, he must be renewed; his whole character must be radically changed. But that this change will never be effected by himself, independently of a divine interposition, is as evident from human observation, as from the declarations of the Bible.

"Let the appeal be made to facts. For how many thousands of years have the powers of moral suasion, of human reason and eloquence, been employed to subdue the vices, and banish the crimes of man. And with what effect? Human depravity has laughed at these puny and powerless weapons. Conscience, indeed, may often have been gained to the side of virtue and duty; but the *heart* has continued the slave of sin. The wisest of the heathen philosophers have felt and acknowledged this. They have confessed that the crimes of men, spurning all earthly restraints, assailed the very heavens. They have confessed that such was the strength of human depravity, that nothing but omnipotence could subdue it. They have confessed that no human being ever attained to virtue, but by a divine influence. Shall these truths which forced themselves on the minds of benighted pagans, be denied or questioned by Christians, under the full blaze of gospel day?" p. 9.

"The doctrine of Regeneration, then, is not the creature of a deluded fancy. It is not a dream of enthusiasm, nor a relic of blind superstition. It is a doctrine most rational and consistent. It commends itself to the enlightened and reflecting mind, as the dictate of sober, undeniable truth." p. 10.

We come next to the divine *sovereignty*, which is nearly allied to the doctrine last considered. On this point, and on others subsequently treated of, the author is equally clear and convincing. But we must take leave of him here, since his arguments will hardly admit of being abridged sufficiently to bring them within the limits which it is necessary we should prescribe to ourselves ordinarily in these notices of single sermons.

LITERARY AND PHILOSOPHICAL INTELLIGENCE.

UNITED STATES.—The number which completes the tenth volume of the *American Journal of Science and Arts* is just published in this city, and is characterized by its usual richness and variety of matter. In this number will be found a notice of twenty-nine Scientific Societies in the U. States. Historical, Literary, Antiquarian, and other Societies, not cultivating natural knowledge, and also academies for the fine arts, are not included in this enumeration.

Walker's system of pronunciation

has lately been obtruded on the public by being affixed to various school-books, or other works designed for the purposes of elementary instruction. Whatever reputation Walker may have obtained in this country, has been owing partly, perhaps chiefly, to his supposed reputation in England. Mr. Webster, however, who has for many years been an attentive observer of the progress of orthoepy, having devoted his life to philological pursuits, states, as the result of his own observation and inquiry in England, that

Walker is by no means generally received as a standard in that country.

"There is no standard in England, except that pronunciation which prevails among respectable people, and this though tolerably uniform, is not precisely the same. Walker's scheme does not give this usage—it deviates from it as much as Sheridan's, and even more. There are whole classes of words, whose pronunciation, as marked by Walker, is not warranted by any respectable practice in England. I presume, I can select a thousand words, if not double the number, from Walker's Dictionary, marked for a pronunciation which no man would venture to use, in any decent society in that country."

The Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, for the district of Virginia, have resolved to establish a University within the bounds of the Conference.

The Bishop of Ohio proposes to honour the transatlantic benefactors of the new Seminary established under his auspices, in the following manner; the town to be laid out on the ground belonging to the Seminary will be called after Lord *Gambier*; the College, after Lord *Kenyon*; the Chapel, after the Countess Dowager of *Rosse*; the names of the streets, neighbouring streams, &c. will perpetuate the memory of other benefactors. The Legislature of the State has authorized the Faculty of the Seminary to confer degrees.

President Holly, of the Transylvania University, has given notice to the Trustees that he shall resign his office at the end of the present session.

The Editors of the New York Observer state that the expense of an education at the University of Virginia, is greater than at any other in the Union.

"There are eight professors, and the students are required to attend the lectures of at least one. They may, if they choose, attend the lectures of two, or more, or of all, at the same time. If they study with one, they pay an annual tuition fee of \$50; if with two, they must pay \$60; if with three, \$75; if with four, \$90; if with all,

\$150. Each professor is furnished with an elegant house, styled a pavilion, and receives a salary of \$1500 from a permanent fund provided by the State, together with his share of all the tuition fees paid by the students. Were a professor to have fifty pupils exclusively under his care, he would receive, besides his salary, an annual income of \$2000. The number of students in December last was 144. Each student pays an annual rent to the University of \$15. There are six stewards or keepers of hotels, who board the students, and who pay for the use of the buildings a considerable rent, which of course comes ultimately out of the pockets of the students. The State of Virginia has already expended above half a million of dollars upon this institution, besides making provision for the payment of the salaries of the professors."

The number of cadets in the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy, at Middletown, Connecticut, is 297. Six have been dismissed for profaneness, intoxication, or other disorderly conduct. The 'police' of the Academy is formed with reference to the character and conduct of 'gentlemen and soldiers.' Provision is made for public worship. Prayers are attended daily in the morning by the Chaplain. Every cadet is strictly required to attend Church on the Sabbath, and to remain at his own room on that day except during the hours of divine service. There are eighteen Professors and Teachers in the various departments of instruction.

FRANCE.—The following statement shows the number of the French clergy, on the first January, 1825. Archbishops and Bishops, 75; Vicars-general, 287; Titular Canons, 725; Honorary Canons, 1255; Rectors, 2628; Curates, 22,225; Vicars, 5396; Priests of Parishes, authorized to preach and receive confessions, 1850; Priests employed as governors or professors in seminaries, 376. The number of ecclesiastical pupils in the seminaries amounts to 4044; and the nuns to 19,271. Total. 57,832. The candidates for the priesthood, if this number be taken as an average, being sufficient, according to the ordinary duration of human life to maintain a complement of more than 150,000 priests.

In our number for February we mentioned the revenue arising from licensed gaming-houses in Paris. The effects of these houses are thus exhibited in the *Revue Encyclopedique*.

"According to a statement, made by authority, there were 371 suicides in this city during the year 1824; namely, 239 men and 132 women. This is 19 less than in the preceding year; but the number of these melancholy events is a heavy charge against our civilization, of which we are so proud, and which still preserves so many traces of barbarity. Gambling-houses, lotteries, brothels, openly authorized, are so many perfidious snares laid for cupidity, misery, weakness, and all the corrupt passions; and these schools of immorality pay a tribute to enjoy a shameful privilege, and obtain a legal existence in the bosom of a social order which they dishonour."

HINDOSTAN.—The great dictionary by the Sultan of Oude, of the existence of which the world was some time since apprised is thus noticed in the *Revue Encyclopedique*:

"ROYAL LEARNING.*—*The Seven Seas; or Dictionary and Grammar of the Persian Language. By his majesty the king of Oude. Lucknow. 1822. In 7 volumes folio, 15 inches in height by 11 in breadth. Printed at his majesty's press.* This magnificent work is the fruit of the labours and researches of the sultan of Oude, *Ubul-mansaffir Muiseddin Schahi Seman Ghatiddin Haider Padischah*; that is to say, the father of the brave, the adorer of the faith, the Schah of the age, the conqueror of the faith, the lion, and the padischah. His majesty has sent several copies to the *East India Company*, to be distributed in Europe. The first six volumes contain the dictionary; the seventh is devoted to the grammar. Upon each leaf, and above the page, are engraved the arms of the sultan: two lions, holding each a standard, two fishes, a throne, a crown, a star, and the waves of the sea. Since the time of Abulfeda, the learned prince of Hamah, of the dynasty Ejub, who died in 1332, and is

well known in Europe as a historian and geographer, no Asiatic prince has done such an essential service to science as that to which it will be indebted to the sultan of Oude, by the composition and publication of this dictionary, the most complete of all that have hitherto appeared."

We are indebted to the *Missionary Herald* for an interesting article which originally appeared in the "*Friend of India*," at Serampore, on the state of the native press in India. Newspapers are first noticed. "These have in seven years increased in number from one to six; of which four are in the Bengalee; and two in the Persian language. The first paper in point of age, is the *Sumachar Durpan*, published at the Serampore Press; of which the first number appeared on the 23d of May, 1818. It was immediately honoured with the notice of that enlightened statesman the Marquis of Hastings, who was pleased in various ways to express his approbation of the attempt. Of this paper it may be sufficient to remark, that its quantity of matter, to use a technical expression, is at present four times that of its first number, that it gives a translation of the political intelligence of the week, brief notices concerning the most remarkable events and discoveries in Europe, and two and sometimes three columns of articles, amusing and instructive, calculated to whet the edge of curiosity in the subscribers and to ensure the continuance of their support. Its political character is neither whig nor tory, ministerial nor anti-ministerial; but it steadily supports the interests of the British Government, the best which India has ever enjoyed, and the only security for the progressive improvement of the country.

"The two next papers are the *Sumbad Koumoodi* and the *Sumbad Chandrika*, the editors of which, not having easy access to the English papers, borrow their political intelligence from the *Durpan*. They give a weekly summary of 'moving accidents' in town and country, and sometimes engage in controversy, occasionally virulent, with each other, the one advocating Hindooism, the other maintaining more liberal sentiments. The youngest of the papers is the *Teemer Nawsuck*, 'the destroyer of darkness;' and

* This article and a part of the preceding we take from the *American Journal of Science and Arts*; they were translated for that work by Prof. Griscom.

it brings to light most wonderful and portentous prodigies. From the perusal of its columns one might almost fancy the golden age of Hindooism returned, and the gods so far reconciled to men as to renew their personal visits for the succour of the faithful. It would be gratifying were the character of the paper more in harmony with its title; for instead of holding up these pretended miracles to derision, it is ever attempting to create a belief of their authenticity.

"With the two Persian papers, we are not so well acquainted; they are, we believe, chiefly occupied with pithless Ukbars, or papers issuing from the native courts, and detailing with minuteness the daily uninteresting and unimportant actions of the native princes, in comparison with which, even the old Cape Gazette or Advertiser is not devoid of interest.

"The number of subscribers to the six native papers, may be estimated at from eight hundred to a thousand; and we may perhaps allot five readers to each paper. The number of readers as well as of subscribers is still small, though gradually on the increase. The scheme is indeed so novel, and so opposite to the great Indian rule of right, (immemorial usage,) that even the degree of success it has obtained, appears marvellous."

The article, to which we are indebted for these notices, contains only the titles and subjects of such works, as have issued from the native press since 1820. As the *subjects* will give some idea of the state of the Hindoo mind, and of the native literature, we shall copy them.

1. A work on Astrology.
2. On the observation of particular days.
3. A work respecting Bhuguvatee.
4. A treatise on the physical nature of men and women.
5. On funeral obsequies.
8. The fruits of obedience to Brahmans.
7. On the attribute of the goddess Radhika.
8. A treatise concerning faith in the Ganges.
9. A work respecting the impression of Krishna's feet.
10. A translation of one division of

the Mitakshura, a standard legal authority in India.

11. The thirty-two imaged throne, a series of tales.

12. A work intended to facilitate the acquisition of English.

13. Moral instruction, translated from the Sungskrit.

14. Conversation between Naadur and Krishna.

15. The tails of a Parrot.

16. The thousand names of Radha.

17. The thousand names of Bhuguvatee.

18. The thousand names of Vishnoo.

19. A work with various circles to enable any one to discover his fortune.

20. Bidya Soondur, an amatory poem.

21. Concerning king Nula, translated from the Sungskrit.

22. Concerning Krishna.

23. Prubodhu Chundrodya, a dramatic work.

24. Gyanu Chudrika.

25. Compilation of the opinions and rites of the Vyragees, in Sungskrit, distributed gratis.

26. The annual Almanac.

27. A work on Bengal music.

28. Translation of a part of the Nyayu system of philosophy.

29. Translation of the Umura-koo-sha, or Sungskrit dictionary.

30. A torment to the irreligious.

31. A work on law.*

The number of copies which have been printed of each, is not so easily ascertained. Of some more, of others less than a thousand, have been sold; but if we take that number as the general average, we shall be near the truth. It is a general remark among the printers and publishers of the native press, that no work remains long on hand; and we have reason to believe that they have in no instance suffered a loss by the printing of any of the works above named. Nearly thirty thousand volumes have thus been sent into circulation within the last four years.

* It will be perceived that this list does not embrace a complete catalogue of the works, in the native language of Rammohun Roy. Such a catalogue was not at the command of the Editor of the *Friend of India*, at the time he prepared his article on the native press.

Ed. Miss. Her.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

RELIGIOUS.

Evangelical preaching is rational preaching. A Sermon, delivered, Nov. 2, 1825, at the Ordination of the Rev. William K. Talbot, as Pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Nottingham-west. By Daniel Dana, D. D. Pastor of a church in Londonderry. Concord, N. H.

The Value of the Soul. A Sermon, preached December 28th, 1825, at the Ordination of Mr. James D. Knowles, as Pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Boston. By Irah Chase, Professor of Biblical Theology in the Newton Theological Institution. Boston: Lincoln & Edmands.

Sixth Annual Report of the Board of Managers of the Missionary Society of the Synod of South Carolina and Georgia. Charleston.

An Address to the Christian Public, and especially to the Ministers and Members of Presbyterian, Reformed Dutch, and Congregational Churches, throughout the United States, on the subject of the Proposed Union between the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, and the United Foreign Missionary Society.

A Plea for Seamen. A Sermon, preached on the occasion of a collection in aid of the funds of the Seamen's

Union Bethel Society, in St. Peter's Church, Baltimore, on the evening of the 19th February, 1826; by J. P. K. Henshaw, A. M. Rector of said Church. Baltimore: Published by request of the Managers of the Society. 8vo. pp. 32.

A Letter to a Friend in Baltimore, on Creeds and Confessions; by Dr. Miller, Princeton, N. J.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The American Journal of Science and Arts. Vol. X. No. 2.—February. Conducted by Benjamin Silliman, Professor of Chemistry, Mineralogy, &c. in Yale College. New Haven: S. Converse.

Ninth Annual Report of the American Society for colonizing the free People of Colour of the United States. With an Appendix. Washington. pp. 66.

Catalogue of the Officers and Cadets, together with the Prospectus and Internal Regulations, of the American Literary, Scientific, and Military Academy, at Middletown, Connecticut.

An Oration, delivered before the Literary and Philosophical Society of New Jersey; by Dr. Miller.

A Lecture upon Classical Literature, delivered before the same Society; by Professor Patten.

RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF MR. FISK.—The American Mission to Palestine has sustained an affecting loss in the death of the Rev. Pliny Fisk. The only particulars of this event which have yet reached us are contained in a letter from Mrs. Goodell, dated Beyroot, Nov. 3, and published in the New York Observer.

"One of our number has already bid adieu to earthly scenes and entered, we believe, on an eternity of never ceasing joys. Yes, our dear brother Fisk is no longer a partaker of our joys or our sorrows. It is a reality, but I can hardly persuade myself that he is to be here no more. So healthy, so cheerful, so diligent in his work. But he is gone. We in our weakness see not as He does, who is the Disposer

of all events. And it is often the case, that those who to human view are the most needed are earliest taken home to glory. So it is with our lamented brother Fisk. He had been in this country so long, that he was well acquainted with the manners, customs, and necessities of the people; and he had acquired such a knowledge of the various languages spoken here, that he could converse readily with them upon almost any subject. The last five months of his life I am happy to say were spent in our family, during which period he had been diligently occupied in making an English and Arabic Dictionary for the use of other missionaries. We had regularly every sabbath a few Arabs in our house, who joined us in reading the Holy Scriptures, and

before whom Mr. Fisk expounded and prayed in their own tongue. How much good he may have effected by these exercises will be known in the great day of accounts.

"The sickness of Mr. Fisk commenced the 11th and ended the 23d of October. During the whole time he suffered much pain. After the fourth day, he was occasionally deprived of his reason, though to our great comfort, he was in lucid intervals able to converse, to pray, and to advise us, also to dictate letters to his father and to his brethren, King and Temple. We often read to him the Scriptures, and also at his request, portions of Mrs. Graham's "Provisions for passing over Jordan." His speech and apparently his senses left him several hours before he died." He died precisely at 3 o'clock, A. M. on sabbath morning, while his brethren were praying and commending his departing spirit to Christ."

NATIONAL DOMESTIC MISSIONARY SOCIETY.

At page 101 of the present volume, we mentioned a meeting in Boston, held for the purpose of considering the expediency of forming a National Domestic Missionary Society. At that meeting the Executive Committee of the United Domestic Missionary Society of New York were desired to invite a general meeting of the friends of domestic missions to be holden at the anniversary of that Society in May next, in the city of New York. The Executive Committee have accordingly issued a Circular with reference to the proposed object. After noticing with approbation the labours of existing domestic Missionary Societies, the Committee proceed:

"But the more the undersigned have been called, in the discharge of their appropriate duties, to acquaint themselves with the spiritual wants of the rising communities of the West and South, and the destitute condition of considerable portions of the older states, the more decided is their conviction that mere local efforts must be, for ever, inadequate to accomplish the wishes of the benevolent. The field which is now waiting for the cultivating hand of the churches of these United States, and which is widening with every wave of emigration that beats back the western wilderness, requires a concentration of the nation's strength to

supply it with labourers sufficient to gather in its harvest.

"This Committee has therefore noticed, of late, with no ordinary pleasure, the progress of sentiment friendly to the formation of a National Society for Home Missions. With solicitous interest, also, have they watched every movement which has been made towards the accomplishment of this immensely important and highly patriotic design. With the same interest, they now cheerfully assume the trust reposed in them by the documents recorded on the opposite page of this sheet, and proceed to invite the attention of the Christian public to further measures. Having also held correspondence with distinguished individuals at the South and West, and received from all a uniform and cordial expression of deep interest in the object, we cannot entertain a doubt that, in the good providence of God, American Christians of the Congregational, Presbyterian, and Dutch Reformed denominations are prepared to sanction the measure which we now propose, and to unite in one concentrated and intense effort to build up the wastes of our common country, and supply all her destitute with the means of salvation.

"The Executive Committee have accordingly resolved to invite a meeting of the Directors of the United Domestic Missionary Society, together with other friends of missions in the United States, to convene at the session room of the Brick Presbyterian Church in this city, on Wednesday, the tenth day of May next, at eight o'clock A. M., for the purpose of forming an AMERICAN HOME MISSIONARY SOCIETY."

The Circular is accompanied with extracts from the minutes of the above mentioned meeting in Boston, and other documents, of which we can give our readers but a part.

"On the 29th of September, 1825, four candidates for the gospel ministry were ordained as Evangelists at Boston, in compliance with a request from "the Executive Committee of the United Domestic Missionary Society" of New York, under whose patronage three of the persons ordained were soon to go forth as missionaries to the western states and territories of the United States. The other individual ordained was expected to labour in the same field, under the patronage of the "Connecticut Missionary Society." This

ordination, taking place the day after the anniversary in the Theological Institution at Andover, was attended by persons interested in the prosperity of Zion, from various parts of the United States. Several of these persons, from Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, and South Carolina, providentially met the day after the ordination, at the house of the Rev. Mr. Wisner, and had their attention called to the desirableness and expediency of forming a national Domestic Missionary Society.

"After discussion, it was their unanimous opinion that the formation of such a Society is both desirable and practicable. A committee was accordingly appointed, consisting of the Rev. Dr. Porter and the Rev. Mr. Edwards, of Andover, Mass. and the Rev. Dr. Taylor, of New Haven, Conn. to make inquiries in relation to the subject, and if they should deem it advisable, invite a meeting of gentlemen, friendly to the object, in Boston, sometime in the month of January ensuing. This committee consulted and held correspondence with gentlemen in different parts of the country; and so general and cordial was the approbation of the design expressed by the persons consulted, that the committee determined to invite a meeting for the purpose of consultation with regard to further measures. They addressed to several individuals a letter, inviting them to attend a meeting to be holden in Boston, on the second Wednesday of January, 1826.

"At the time designated by the above named committee, the proposed meeting was held at the house of Mr. Henry Homes, in Boston."

We have not room for the list of very respectable names which composed this meeting.

"The committee, appointed in September last, then reported, in part, in relation to the expediency of forming such an institution as is proposed, and the principles which should regulate the proceedings had for the accomplishment of the object.

"The considerations named by the committee as evincing the expediency of the measure proposed were the following:—The influence such a society will be likely to have on the more favoured portions of our country, in perpetuating their religious institutions and character; its favourable bearing upon the Southern and Western States

and Territories, in extending to them the blessings of pure and undefiled religion; its effect on the destitute, in exciting and encouraging them to make exertions for the support of religious institutions; the influence it may be expected to have on local domestic missionary societies already existing, in diffusing information among them, and increasing their efforts; and the tendency it will have to produce, among the friends of evangelical religion in the United States, greater union of feeling and exertion.

"The principles named as proper to be considered as fundamental in all proceedings in relation to this subject, were the following:—1. A union of all denominations not to be attempted as a formal thing. 2. Local societies now existing, not to be superseded, except in accordance with their own desire, and not to be impeded in their operations, but to be strengthened and stimulated.

"Several gentlemen, present, then expressed their views in relation to the points presented in this part of the Committee's report, and the meeting unanimously voted their concurrence.

"It was then, on motion, unanimously resolved that it is, in the opinion of this meeting, expedient to attempt the formation of a *National Domestic Missionary Society*.

"After consultation, it was unanimously voted that it is highly desirable that a more general meeting should be requested by the Executive Committee of the United Domestic Missionary Society of New York, and that that Society should become the American Domestic Missionary Society, should no special reasons occur to render such a measure inexpedient."

NEW MISSIONARY TO PERSIA.—The following extract of a letter from a gentleman in Paris to a friend in this city, furnishes a gratifying indication that the Great Head of the Church does not design to suffer the twilight which was shed on the people of Persia by the labours of Henry Martyn to be again lost in the surrounding darkness.

"Dr. Foot is a young man of devoted piety, who has spent nine years in India as surgeon in the army, and two years in Persia. He has visited our missionary settlements at Ceylon, and mentioned to me, of his own accord, that they were conducted with admira-

ble judgment and effect, and that in his view, as the result of long observation, our missionaries, in making large establishments among the nation in the interior, and in giving instruction to them in science, in connexion with religion, were pursuing the only course that can ever succeed. The people, he says, have the highest respect for those who possess superior knowledge, and who use and communicate it for the benefit of the nation. Such men they are willing to hear on religious subjects; to such men they will confide their children, and while they sought only the blessing of earth, God in many instances has made them wise unto eternal life. Dr. Foot is studying Persian with the celebrated De Sacy, and means to establish himself as a physician and surgeon in the heart of Persia for the sole purpose of gaining that influence which

may enable him gradually to insinuate the gospel among them. He hopes to form a large scientific establishment for this purpose; and to this object he has devoted his life and what property he possesses."

DONATIONS TO RELIGIOUS AND CHARITABLE INSTITUTIONS.

In the month of February.

To the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, \$3913.22, exclusive of legacies.

To the American Bible Society, \$5901.63.

To the American Education Society, \$280.74.

To the United Foreign Missionary Society, in January, \$3303.04.

ORDINATIONS AND INSTALLATIONS.

Jan. 18.—The Rev. OVA P. HOUGH was installed Pastor of the First Presbyterian church at Pottsdam, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Asahel Parmelee, of Malone.

Feb. 5.—The Rev. JOHN BERRY MEACHAM, a coloured man of the Baptist denomination, was ordained to the work of the ministry at St. Louis, Mississippi. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Halbert.

Feb. 8.—The Rev. MOSES INGALLS over the Congregational church at Barnard. Sermon by the Rev. Ammi Nicols, of Braintree. The Rev. PRESTON TAYLOR was at the same time ordained as an Evangelist.

Feb. 12.—The Rev. GEORGE H. FISHER was ordained Pastor of a Dutch Reformed Church recently established near Somerville, N. J.

Feb. 12.—The Rev. H. M. MASON was admitted to the order of Priests, at Fayetteville, N. C. by Bishop Ravenscroft.

Feb. 14.—The Rev. JARVIS GILBERT was ordained as an Evangelist at Fairhaven, Vt. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Drewry.

Feb. 15.—The Rev. CHARLES BENT-

LEY was ordained Pastor of the church at Middle Haddam, Conn.

Feb. 16.—The Rev. H. NORTON was ordained at Utica as an Evangelist. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Finney.

Feb. 19.—The Rev. RICHARD D. VAN KLEEK was ordained Pastor of the church at Somerville, N. J. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Zabriskie, of Millstone.

Feb. 22.—The Rev. LUKE A. SPORFORD (installed) over the Congregational church and society in Brentwood, N. H. Sermon by the Rev. Abraham Burnham.

Feb. 25.—The Rev. MOSES CHASE was installed Pastor of the First Presbyterian church in Plattsburgh, N. Y. Sermon by the Rev. Mr. Smith, of Burlington.

March 1.—The Rev. REUBEN MASON was installed Pastor of the church at Glover, Vt. Sermon by the Rev. Drury Fairbank, of Littleton.

March 2.—The Rev. BENJAMIN DEAN, at Swanzev, N. H. as an Evangelist. Sermon by the Rev. Elijah Willard, of Dublin.

March 8.—The Rev. OREN BROWN was installed Pastor of the second con-

gregational church in Hardwick, Vt.
Sermon by the Rev. Leonard Worces-
ter, of Peacham.

March 22.—The Rev. LYMAN BEECH-

ER, D. D. was installed Pastor of the
new church in Hanover-street, Boston.
Sermon by the Rev. Dr. Humphrey,
President of Amherst College.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

FOREIGN.

RUSSIA.—We mentioned in our last number, that there had been numerous contradictory statements respecting the succession to the throne, but that the latest accounts seemed to have settled the question in favour of Constantine. It is however now clear that the crown is placed upon the head of Nicholas. The right of Constantine had been renounced during the life of Alexander, and according to a mutual understanding among the members of the imperial family. The new emperor accordingly, on the 26th of December, published at St. Petersburg his manifesto, giving a full account of the renunciation of his brother, with the acts which set it forth. This manifesto, upon the publication of which the troops were to have taken the oath of allegiance, occasioned serious disturbances in the capital. Some of the troops hesitated, and two companies of 'the Moscow regiment' marched out of their barracks with their colours, and proclaimed Constantine I. In this they were joined by some of the populace. General Miloradovitch, in an attempt to harangue the rebels, was shot. The Emperor himself, appearing unarmed, endeavoured to quell the mutiny; but his efforts proving ineffectual, troops and cannon were brought forward, and the refractory companies were quickly dispersed. About 200 were said to have been killed. The disaffection was confined chiefly to the Moscow regiment, and the conduct of this regiment is attributed to the circumstance of their being a part of Constantine's own troops.

The documents made public by the abovementioned manifesto, were, 1. The letter of Constantine to Alexander, dated January 14th, 1822, in which he proposes to renounce his right to the succession. The motive by which he professes to be actuated in this measure, is, that "he does not lay claim to the spirit, the abilities, or the strength, which would be required, if he

should ever exercise the high dignity to which he may be entitled by birth."

2. The reply of Alexander, who, having laid the matter before the Empress Mother, says, "From the reasons which you state, we have both of us only to leave you at full liberty to follow your firm resolution, and to pray the Almighty to grant the most benign consequences to such pure sentiments."

3. The manifesto of Alexander, dated August 1823, by which he confirms the renunciation of Constantine, and provides for the succession of Nicholas. This act was deposited in the grand cathedral church of Ascension, and with his majesty's "three highest authorities, the Holy Synod, the Senate, and the Directing Senate." 4. A letter from Constantine to the Empress Mother, expressing his grief for the death of his imperial brother, and declaring his faithful adherence to his former act of renunciation. 5. His letter to Nicholas of the same date and to the same effect as that to the Empress Mother.

Such briefly is the history of this extraordinary affair thus far. Respecting its future results, French editors, profess still to entertain disquieting apprehensions. At the latest dates from that country it was said that Petersburg was the only place where an attempt had yet been made to proclaim Nicholas; and there an insurrection was the consequence. Every where else Constantine was proclaimed on the first intelligence of the death of Alexander; and the oath was generally taken. Gen. Sacken had it administered to his army, which amounts 100,000 men.

AFRICA.—The chiefs of the Sherbro Bulloms have voluntarily placed their country under the protection of the British government. By a formal treaty, dated September 24, they grant to his Britannic Majesty, "The full, entire, free, and unlimited, right, title, possession, and entire sovereignty, of all

the territories and dominions to them belonging." They were, it seems, driven to this measure by a fierce warfare brought against them by the Kussos, a tribe of the interior, who having successively trodden down their neighbours, had at length reached the Sherbro Bulloms, in their devastating progress, and threatened them with destruction or slavery.

The country thus unexpectedly ceded to the British, lies directly south-east of Sierra Leone and comprises a line of sea coast of 120 miles in length, and upwards of 5000 square miles of the most fertile land in this part of Africa, being watered with seven rivers of considerable extent and importance. The produce of these rivers has always been very great; and will rapidly increase in quantity, as the property of the natives is now rendered secure from plunder and devastation. The principal articles of lawful export have hitherto been ivory, palm-oil, camwood, and rice: of the latter, the Bagroo river alone furnished 600 tons in one season.

However the good people of England may be disposed to congratulate themselves on account of the commercial advantages which they will derive from this acquisition, there is another point of view in which they will deem it still more important, and on account of which the philanthropic of all countries will make them welcome to their new possession. The traffic in human flesh can no longer exist in the ceded territory. "The slave trade of the coast between Sierra Leone and the Gallinas" says the editor of the London Missionary Register, "is for ever annihilated. We may fairly compute, that from 15,000 to 20,000 wretched beings were annually exported from the territory lately acquired: it was to support this horrible trade that the surrounding nations were constantly engaged in sanguinary wars; which have nearly depopulated the once rich and fertile countries of the Sherbro."

DOMESTIC.

CONGRESSIONAL.—If the comparative importance of the subjects which have occupied Congress for the last six or eight weeks, is to be estimated by the length and number of speeches they have called forth, the mission to Panama, and various resolutions, to amend the constitution must have the

precedence. The Panama question was discussed in the Senate chiefly with closed doors. With what political logic and foresight, therefore, our southern statesmen, so long withstood the measure, we have not been permitted to see, nor have we room, or time, to digest what we have seen. Mr. Randolph, in a very discursive speech, endeavoured to embarrass the subject by connecting it with negro emancipation: it would affect, ultimately, the condition of slavery in the United States. By what process his erratic mind reached this conclusion, we cannot tell; except that the sable skin of those who will compose the congress at Panama, the emancipation acts of the South American governments, the character of Bolivar, Cuba, Hayti, and the Colonization Society, were links in the chain. The question was finally settled by a small majority in favour of the mission. The vote was taken at two o'clock in the morning, the majority having resolved not to adjourn without a decision.

The subject is now before the House, with whom it remains to provide for the expense of the mission.

Of the multitude, we had almost said, of proposed amendments to the constitution, some have had the merit of requiring little discussion, and most have furnished evidence of the ambition, retrospective or prospective, in which they had their birth. Some may have been dictated by honest, perhaps enlightened patriotism. Those introduced by Mr. McDuffie, have been zealously supported and ably opposed. We are sorry to find Mr. Everett, in his eloquent speech on this subject, straying from the principles in which, as a citizen of a free state, he had been educated, broadly to avow his approbation of negro slavery, and justifying this avowal by arguments which would go equally to support the Holy Alliance or whatever other form of political despotism, the orator may have declaimed against on other occasions.

A project for the colonization of the aborigines has been submitted by the Secretary of War, to the Committee on Indian affairs. In its general features it resembles the plan proposed last year by Mr. Calhoun. But we have no room, we find, for this or other topics on which we intended to remark.

Answers to Correspondents next month.